NATIONAL ARCHIVES MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS

MICROCOPY
215
ROLL
33

NATIONAL ARCHIVES MICROFILM PUBLICATIONS

Microcopy No. 215

MINUTES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Roll 33

October 7, 1929 - May 31, 1932

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Washington: 1954

NOTES ON ROLL 33

The three volumes reproduced on this roll have the following backstrip titles: (1) "Minutes / 1929 / Supreme Court / of the / United States"; (2) "Minutes / 1930 / Supreme Court / of the / United States"; and (3) "Minutes / 1931 / Supreme Court / of the / United States." They contain the minutes of the Supreme Court of the United States from October 7, 1929, to May 31, 1932.

The first volume contains the minutes of the Court from October 7, 1929, to June 2, 1930; the second, from October 6, 1930, to June 1, 1931; and the third, from October 5, 1931, to May 31, 1932.

VOLUME

1929

At the Capitol of the United States, in the City of Washington, and District of Columbia, being the present Seat of the National Government of the United States, on the first Monday of October (being the 7th day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand, nine hundred and twenty-nine and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and fifty-fourth, The Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin B. Pettus, It is ordered that J. Scott Matthews, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert A. Jones, It is ordered that J. George Kerr, Esquire, of Sabetha, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Le Fevre, It is ordered that Howard S. LeRoy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Max Rhoade, It is ordered that I. Charles Schwalb, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred L. Van Dolsen, It is ordered that Samuel Kaufman, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Kratz, It is ordered that Pinckney G. McElwee, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert A. Littleton, It is ordered that Homer L. Bruce, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Carver W. Wolfe, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles M. Galloway, It is ordered that Louis A. Maxson, Esquire, of Claremont, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that William P. Allen, Esquire, of Bartow, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Thomas G. Gregory, Esquire, of St. Marys, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. March, It is ordered that David Richard Thomas, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ben Jenkins, It is ordered that David J. Shorb, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George C. Butte, It is ordered that John L. Gay, Esquire, of San Juan, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett, It is ordered that Isaac Pacht, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Lobingier, It is ordered that Ernest Theodore Simmang, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that James W. Ewing, Esquire, of Wheeling, State of West Virginia, and F. S. Spruill, Esquire, of Rocky Mount, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Beall Kent, It is ordered that Ralph E. Lum, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew M. Henderson, It is ordered that John Ruffalo, Esquire, of Youngstown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorneyand Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

O R D E R.

The Court, after entertaining motions for admission to the bar, and other motions noticed for today, will adjourn in order that the members of the Court may pay their respects to the President of the United States.

The Court will meet upon Monday next, October 14th, upon which day it will announce orders and receive such motions as may be submitted, and will then adjourn from that day until Monday, October 21st, when oral arguments in cases especially set and cases on the regular docket will be commenced. The Court will thus be enabled to devote time during the next two weeks to the disposition of the petitions for writs of certiorari which are submitted today.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
52 vs.
W. J. Howard.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested;

Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party petitioner in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

October 7, 1929.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
67 vs.
American Code Company, Incorporated.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested;

Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party petitioner in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

October 7, 1929.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
92 vs.
North Texas Lumber Company.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested;

Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party petitioner in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

October 7, 1929.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
99 vs.
Guy C. Earl.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party petitioner in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
323 vs.
Kansas City Structural Steel Co.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party petitioner in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
324 vs.
Kansas City Structural Steel Company.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party petitioner in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
356 vs.
The Pilliod Lumber Company.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party petitioner in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Wilson Banking Company,
Petitioner,
109 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Frederick C. Renziehausen,
Petitioner,
114 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Warren E. Burns, et al.,
Petitioner,
175 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

John T. Burkett,
Petitioner,
180 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Griffith Henshaw, Executor, etc.,
Petitioner,
181 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

The Greylock Mills,
Petitioner,
182 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

October 7, 1929.

John G. Lonsdale,
Petitioner,
249 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

October 7, 1929.

The Hoosier Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
286 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

October 7, 1929.

S. Maitove & Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
298 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Ohio Clover Leaf Dairy Company,
Petitioner,
348 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Simmons Company,
Petitioner,
354 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Symington-Anderson Company,
Petitioner,
366 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Uniform Printing & Supply Company,
Petitioner,
369 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Remington Rand, Inc.,
Petitioner,
377 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Remington Rand, Inc.,
Petitioner,
378 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Paso Robles Mercantile Company,
Petitioner,
406 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Henry L. Berg and Rose Berg, his wife,
Petitioners,
421 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested; Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

Kunglig Jarnvagsstyrelsen, also known as the Royal Administration of The Swedish State Railways,

Petitioner,

273 vs.

Dexter & Carpenter, Inc.

The suggestion as to petitioner's legal status and claim of immunity was presented to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, specially appearing for the Department of State of the United States.

Federal Radio Commission,

Petitioner,

——,Original. vs.

George E. Martin, Chief Justice, et al.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus and/or prohibition was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claude R. Branch in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

Chicago Frog & Switch Company,

Petitioner,

272 vs.

The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. John A. Kratz, in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Funch, Edye & Co., Inc., and the Associated Operating Company as amici curiae, in this cause.

Kunglig Jarnvagsstyrelsen, also known as the Royal Administration of The Swedish State Railways,

Petitioner,

273 vs.

Dexter & Carpenter, Inc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. J. Harry Covington, in behalf of Mr. V. Assarsson, Charge d'Affaires a.i. of the Kingdom of Sweden, in that behalf, leave was granted to file statement of the Kingdom of Sweden covering the petitioner's legal status and claim of immunity.

Charles A. Corliss,
Petitioner,
334 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Matthew E. O'Brien, in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Marcel E. Gerf, et al., as amici curiae, in this cause.

International Shoe Company,
Appellant,
579, October Term, 1928. vs.
Stratton Shartell, Attorney General, etc., et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. J. D. Williamson, in that behalf, leave was granted the appellant to file a supplement to the petition for a rehearing in this cause.

Edward Eliason, et al.,
Appellants,
347 vs.
Charles Wilborn, et al.

The motion of Clayton F. Smith, Registrar of Titles of Cook County, Illinois, for leave to appear as amicus curiae or to intervene as a party and to dismiss for want of jurisdiction, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Scott Matthews, in that behalf.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The State of New York and The City of New York.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the reply of the complainant to the answer of the defendant, The State of New York, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

October 7, 1929.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
18, Original. vs.
The City of New York.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the reply of the complainant to the answer of the defendant, and motion for the appointment of a Special Master in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
October 7, 1929.

New Jersey Bell Telephone Company,
Appellant,
254 vs.
State Board of Taxes and Assessment, etc.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Duane E. Minard for the appellee.

Ex Parte:
In the matter of Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al.,
—, Original. Petitioners,

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and motion for leave to amend and supplement the petition for writ of mandamus, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Spaulding Flannery, in behalf of Mr. Bruce Scott, Mr. H. H. Fields, Mr. F. G. Dorety, Mr. M. S. Gunn, and Mr. Dennis F. Lyons for the petitioners.

J. Du Pratt White, et al.,
Appellants,
336 vs.
Sparkill Realty Corporation, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter H. Pollak for the appellants, and suggestions in support thereof were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jackson A. Dykman for the appellees.

Thomas A. Early, Receiver, etc.,
Petitioner,
226 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. George P. Barse, in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of J. W. Pole, Comptroller of the Currency of the United States, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

M. C. McNair, as Receiver of the England National Bank of Little Rock,
Petitioner,
162 vs.
F. Kamer Darragh.

The resignation of M. C. McNair, as receiver of the England National Bank of Little Rock, having been suggested;
Therefore, on consideration of the motion of counsel in behalf of petitioner to substitute Joseph A. Gamble, present receiver of the England National Bank of Little Rock, as the party petitioner in this cause;
It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John F. Sherry,
Petitioner,
94 vs.
The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the brief of the respondent out of time,
It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
240 vs.
Harry W. Lutton.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the brief of respondent out of time,
It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alexander Sprunt & Sons, Inc., et al.,
Appellants,
19 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The motion to pass and assign this case for argument, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. C. Fulbright for the appellants.

Hugh W. Grant, Receiver, etc.,
Petitioner,
9 vs.
A. B. Leach & Company, Inc.

The motion of Hugh W. Grant, Trustee in bankruptcy, for leave to intervene as a party petitioner in this case, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Andrew M. Henderson in support of the motion, and by Mr. Conrad H. Poppenhusen, Mr. Edward R. Johnston, and Mr. Henry Jackson Darby for the respondents, in opposition thereto.

Bickett Coal & Coke Company,
Petitioner,
299 vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this case to the Court of Claims for additional findings of fact, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Josephus C. Trimble for the petitioner.

Geo. T. Cottingham, et al.,
Appellants,
267 vs.
Frank G. Snook, as Chief of Division of Motor Vehicles, etc.

The motion to consolidate this case with case No. 86, for hearing as one case, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Abbott P. Mills, in behalf of counsel for the appellants.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
19, Original. vs.
The State of Delaware.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the answer of the defendant in this cause,
It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

May Cook,
Petitioner,
306 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the brief of petitioner out of time,
It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Nevada,
Complainant,
4, Original. vs.
Crown Willamette Paper Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a stipulation of counsel to continue this cause,
It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter A. Lorenz, et al.,
Petitioners,
283 vs.
James S. Mahon, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the brief of respondents out of time,
It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Macallen Company,
Appellant,
578, October Term, 1928. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of Mr. Hamilton Ward for the State of New York, ~~[illegible]~~, leave was granted to file a brief of the State of New York, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

The Macallen Company, Appellant, 578, October Term, 1928. vs. Commonwealth of Massachusetts.	The motion for leave to file a brief of the American Bankers Association, as amicus curiae, in this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. Colladay in that behalf.
The Macallen Company, Appellant, 578, October Term, 1928. vs. Commonwealth of Massachusetts.	The motion for leave to file a brief of Massachusetts National Bank Association, as amicus curiae, in this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip Nichols in that behalf.
Behn, Meyer & Company, Limited, Petitioner, 360 vs. Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.	The motion for leave to file brief of W. D. Guthrie, Isadore J. Kresel, and Bernard Hershkopf, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Bradley in support of the motion, and by Mr. Spencer Gordon for the petitioner, in opposition thereto.
The Texas & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, 89 vs. Mrs. Wallace Guidry, Administratrix of the Estate of Wallace Guidry, deceased.	On consideration of the motion for leave to file the brief of respondent out of time, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James S. Harrington, et al.,
Appellants,
90 vs.
James Sloan.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. A. C. Kennedy and Mr. Charles L. McLaughlin for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Wymer Dressler and Mr. Robert D. Neely for the appellants, in opposition thereto.

Allen & Reed, Inc.,
Appellant,
206 vs.
Walter A. Presbrey, et al.

The motion to dismiss this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elmer S. Chace for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. William W. Moss for the appellants, in opposition thereto.

Suncrest Lumber Company,
Appellant,
91 vs.
North Carolina Park Commission, a Corporation, Eugene C. Brooks, D. M. Buck, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court, and it appearing to the Court that the parties have failed to print the transcript of the record,

It is therefore, in pursuance of the thirteenth rule of this Court, now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aetna Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
223
Fred H. Allen, Administrator of the Estate of Arthur N. Dority and Carrie J. Dority.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jennie V. David,
Petitioner,
190 vs.
Thomas D. Hubbard, as Trustee, etc.;
William V. David,
Petitioner,
191 vs.
Thomas D. Hubbard, as Trustee.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elwood G. Hubert for the petitioners.

Robert G. Meadows,
Petitioner,
269 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jean S. Breitenstein for the petitioner.

Anthony Brown, et al.,
Petitioners,
388 vs.
The State of California.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George C. Faulkner and Mr. J. J. Henderson for the petitioners.

The Second National Bank of Saginaw, etc.,
Petitioner,
72 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore B. Benson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Joseph H. Sheppard for the respondent.

Arthur E. Colgate, Administrator of the Estate of Clinton G. Colgate, deceased,
Petitioner,
74 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. King, Mr. Louis Titus, and Mr. C. Bascom Slemp for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the respondent.

Dampskibsselskabet Norden,
Petitioner,
76 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Hickox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Piedmont Grocery Company,
Petitioner,
78 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry C. Fisher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

E. J. Kelly,
Petitioner,
80 vs.
F. E. Watkins, Paul S. Cotner, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. E. Blake for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. B. Moore for the respondents.

Employers' Liability Assurance Corporation, etc.
Petitioner,
81 vs.
Mrs. Myrtis Cook, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clyde A. Sweeton and Mr. W. A. Vinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. A. Simmons for the respondents.

William M. Abbott,
Petitioner,
82 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. McCarron and Mr. George E. Hamilton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

Higginbotham-Bailey-Logan Company, et al.
Petitioners,
83 vs.
International Shoe Company (Peters Branch), et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lee Gammage Carter for the petitioners.

Benjamin Rogers,
Petitioner,
84 vs.
Canadian National Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William R. Walsh and Mr. Joseph Walsh for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. R. Martin and Mr. Leo J. Carrigan for the respondent.

Hugh Wilhite, W. H. Pittman, Harris L. Moore, Trustees, etc., Petitioners, vs. The United States.

85

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. L. Hamby and Mr. Henry J. Richardson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

The Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Lula Carroll, Administratrix, etc.

87

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Rogers, Mr. Morison R. Waite, and Mr. Cassius W. McMullen for the petitioner, and by Mr. William J. Hughes and Mr. O. H. Montgomery for the respondent.

A. S. Foster, Petitioner, vs. Alabama Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company.

88

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Palmer Pillans for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry H. Smith for the respondent.

The Texas and Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Wallace Guidry, Administratrix, etc.

89

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Sixth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. D. Gresham for the petitioner and by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondent.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
92 vs.
North Texas Lumber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Randolph C. Shaw for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert B. Hall for the respondent.

Anita H. Cooper,
Petitioner,
93 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wayne Johnson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Lisle A. Smith, and Mr. Henry A. Cox for the respondent.

John F. Sherry,
Petitioner,
94 vs.
The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Andrew M. Henderson for the petitioner and by Mr. Union C. De Ford for the respondent.

Compagnie Generale Transatlantique,
Petitioner,
95 vs.
The American Tobacco Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph P. Nolan and Mr. Anthony J. Ernest for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jonothan H. Holmes, Mr. John David Lannon, and Mr. Clinton Robb for the respondent.

County of Gallatin, J. S. Taylor, as Treasurer, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
96 vs.
Yellowstone Park Transportation Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. J. Walsh for the petitioners, and by Mr. T. B. Weir for the respondent.

Minetta G. Cutting,
Petitioner,
97 vs.
Mahlon R. Bryan, Spencer K. Mulford, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Peter F. Dunne for the petitioner, and by Mr. John L. McNab for the respondents.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
99 vs.
Guy C. Earl.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Millar E. McGilchrist for the petitioner, and by Mr. Warren Olney, Jr., and Mr. J. M. Mannon, Jr., for the respondent.

Mrs. Annie S. Jones, as Administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
100 vs.
Parnell Whaley, as Administratrix, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Wolfe for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. J. Hydrick and Mr. Adam H. Moss for the respondents.

Wilbert J. McCloskey, Trading as The McCloskey Torch Company, Petitioner, vs. The Toledo Pressed Steel Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Kirk for the petitioner.
101	
Francis C. McDonald, et al., Petitioners, vs. State of Louisiana ex rel. Dema Realty Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Waguespack and Mr. W. J. Waguespack, Jr., for the petitioners.
102	
Percy Jay Fuller, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stanley C. Fowler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.
103	
William Morgan, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America; Henry Hurst, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Hamilton Lewis, Mr. Benjamin P. Epstein, and Mr. Bernhardt Frank for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.
105	
106	

John C. Prendergast,
Petitioner,
107 vs.
Silverado Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Martin and Mr. J. O. Davies for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank A. Huffer, Mr. W. H. Hayden, Mr. F. T. Merritt, and Mr. Lane Summers for the respondent.

Frederick J. Mohr and Walter R. Mohr, Executors, etc.,
Petitioners.
108 vs.
A. Bruce Bielaski, Trustee, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Murray Corrington for the petitioners.

Wilson Banking Company,
Petitioner,
109 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. M. Pepper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Harvey R. Gamble for the respondent.

Pauline V. Beyer, doing business as Portland Hotel,
Petitioner,
110 vs.
Harold M. Smith.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright and Mr. Philip Kreshler for the petitioner.

The H. Kobacker & Sons Company,
Petitioner,
111 vs.
Norwich Union Indemnity Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James I. Boulger for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. A. Hauxhurst for the respondent.

Guaranty Trust Company of New York, et al.,
Petitioners,
112 vs.
Noxon Chemical Products Company, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Cannon for the petitioners, and by Mr. Robert Carey for the respondents.

Frederick C. Renziehausen,
Petitioner,
114 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Seifert and Mr. William Wallace Booth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. John Vaughan Groner for the respondent.

Loewer Realty Company,
Petitioner,
116 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, individually, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Barrett Prettyman, Mr. Karl D. Loos, and Mr. Arthur B. Hyman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. John Vaughan Groner, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

International-Great Northern Railroad Company and American Bonding Company of Baltimore, Petitioners, 117 vs. W. A. Hailey.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Tenth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. L. Cook and Mr. Frank Andrews for the petitioners.
Florsheim Brothers Drygoods Co.,Ltd., Petitioner, 118 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. H. Randolph for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Barham R. Gary for the respondent.
Galveston Dry Dock & Construction Company, Petitioner, 120 vs. United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Brantley Harris and Mr. John David Watkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.
Charles H. Clark and Clark Car Company, etc., Petitioners, 121 vs. Frank J. Lanahan and Clark Car Company, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Freeman and Mr. William L. Day for the petitioners, and by Mr. Owen J. Roberts and Mr. John S. Weller for the respondents.

Federal Radio Commission,
Petitioner,
122 vs.
General Electric Co., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis G. Caldwell and Mr. Paul M. Segal for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank J. Hogan, Mr. William H. Donovan, Mr. Charles E. Hughes, and Mr. Allen S. Hubbard for the respondents.

Royal Insurance Co., Ltd., et al.,
Petitioners,
123 vs.
U. S. Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Crawley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

National City Bank,
Petitioner,
124 vs.
Edward Carter.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Longstreet Heiskell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sam O. Bates and Mr. Walter Chandler for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
125 vs.
Sidney B. Sligh.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, Mr. W. Clifton Stone, and Mr. James T. Brady for the petitioner, and by Mr. Loy J. Molumby for the respondent.

J. E. Thomas,
Petitioner,
126 vs.
Jay Gates, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Cox for the petitioner.

Universal Battery Co.,
Petitioner,
127 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Maurice Morris for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. George C. Butte, and Mr. R. C. Williamson for the respondent.

The United States,
Petitioner,
128 vs.
American Can Company;
The United States,
Petitioner,
129 vs.
Missouri Can Company;
The United States,
Petitioner,
130 vs.
Detroit Can Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Assistant Attorney General Willebrandt, and Mr. Millar E. McGilchrist for the petitioner, and by Mr. Graham Sumner for the respondents.

William P. Whitaker,
Petitioner,
131 vs.
The United States of America;
John Joseph McCann,
Petitioner,
132 vs.
The United States of America.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Silas B. Axtell for the petitioner in No. 131, by Mr. John Joseph McCann, pro se, in No. 132, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Frank S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Ralph W. Harbison,

Petitioner,

134 vs.

C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector,etc.;

Joseph Hudson Brooks,

Petitioner,

135 vs.

C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector,etc.;

James E. Lewis,

Petitioner,

136 vs.

C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector,etc.;

Lee C. Morganroth,

Petitioner,

137 vs.

C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector,etc.;

Harry William Croft,

Petitioner,

138 vs.

C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector,etc.;

Raymond Willey,

Petitioner,

139 vs.

C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector,etc.;

William Walker,

Petitioner,

140 vs.

C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector,etc.;

R. H. Youngman,

Petitioner,

141 vs.

C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector,etc.;

Otto M. Reif,

Petitioner,

142 vs.

C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector,etc.;

Elizabeth W. Pontefract,
Petitioner,
143 vs.
C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector, etc.;
William Albert Harbison,
Petitioner,
144 vs.
C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector, etc.;
Emma J. Harbison,
Petitioner,
145 vs.
C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector, etc.;
Nin McQuillen,
Petitioner,
146 vs.
C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector, etc.;
Kenneth Seaver,
Petitioner,
147 vs.
C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector, etc.;
P. R. Hilleman,
Petitioner,
148 vs.
C. G. Llewellyn, formerly Collector, etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. E. McCloskey, Jr., and Mr. F. H. Atwood for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Howard T. Jones, and Mr. Millar E. McGilchrist for the respondent.

Montgomery Cotton Mills (Inc.),
Petitioner,
150 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Stanley Hinrichs for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. George G. Butte, and Mr. R. C. Williamson for the respondent.

Ward Baking Corporation,
Petitioner,
151 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Miller and Mr. Stuart Chevalier for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. George C. Butte, and Mr. McClure Kelley for the respondent.

Paul G. Huckins,
Petitioner,
152 vs.
Willis B. Smith, as Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank S. Quinn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Will Steel for the respondent.

United States ex rel. American Silver Producers Association, et al.
Petitioners,
153 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Thomas, Mr. J. Harry Covington, Mr. George K. Thomas, and Mr. Spencer Gordon for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. John T. Fowler, Jr., for the respondent.

American Surety Co. of New York,
Petitioner,
154 vs.
Blount County Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Douglas Arant for the petitioner.

R. P. Shick, Assignee of Walter G. Roland,
Petitioner,
155 vs.
W. A. Goodman, Trustee of H. M. Albright.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert P. Shick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Caleb J. Bieber for the respondent.

Abe Schefman, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
156 vs.
Edward DeGroot, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clare J. Hall for the petitioners.

Trinidad Asphalt Manufacturing Co.,
Petitioner,
157 vs.
Western Willete Co., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard G. Cook for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. Mayner Wallace, Mr. Gurney E. Newlin, and Mr. George Eigel for the respondents.

Fidelity and Deposit Co. of Maryland,
Petitioner,
158 vs.
I. Townsend Burden.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph F. Murray for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles S. Aronstam for the respondent.

Fidelity and Deposit Co. of Maryland,
Petitioner,
159 vs.
I. Townsend Burden.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph F. Murray for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles S. Aronstam for the respondent.

William H. Gill,
Petitioner,
160 vs.
Norma H. Smith, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carey Van Fleet for the petitioner, and by Mr. Malcolm McAvoy for the respondent.

Jonesboro Grocer Co.,
Petitioner,
161 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald Horne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. George C. Butte, and Mr. Charles R. Pollard for the respondent.

Joseph A. Gamble, as Receiver, etc.
Petitioner,
162 vs.
F. Kamer Darragh.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. A. Lasley and Mr. H. M. Trieber for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ashley Cockrill and Mr. H. M. Armistead for the respondent.

John L. Mimnaugh, Jr., Executor, etc., Petitioner,
163 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. L. Hamby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Henry A. Cox for the respondent.

G. L. Ramsey and Alice M. Ramsey, Petitioners,
166 vs.
The City of Oxford, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Jones, Mr. B. R. Leydig, and Mr. K. M. Geddes for the petitioners, and by Mr. W. A. Ayres, Mr. Austin M. Cowan, and Mr. Chester I. Long for the respondents.

Mrs. Walker M. Long, Temporary Administratrix, etc., et al. Petitioners,
168 vs.
American Railway Express Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Beeman Strong and Mr. Will E. Orgain for the petitioners.

The United States, Petitioner,
170 vs.
Frederic J. Middlebrook, as Receiver of Hudson Navigation Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. C. Carlin, Mr. M. Carter Hall, and Mr. Leslie C. Garnett for the respondents.

Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company,

Petitioner,

171 vs.

Louis M. Kepner.

Patrick J. Cullen for the respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Houts, Mr. S. W. Baxter, and Mr. H. N. Quigley for the petitioner, and by Mr.

New York Life Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

172 vs.

Valentine Gits.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer H. Cooper, Mr. Samuel Topliff, and Mr. Louis H. Cooke for the petitioner, and by Mr. Daniel M. Dever for the respondent.

Alvaro Boera and Ramon J. Boera, copartners, etc.,

Petitioners,

174 vs.

The Steamship "Buckleigh", her engines, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank I. Finkler for the petitioners and by Mr. L. de Grove Potter for the respondents.

Warren M. Burns, Williard A. Walsh, et al.,

Petitioners,

175 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph F. Murray for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Randolph C. Shaw, and Mr. John Vaughan Groner for the respondent.

Arthur J. Dibble,
Petitioner,
176 vs.
Unadilla Valley Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David F. Lee for the petitioner, and by Mr. Merritt Bridges for the respondent.

Frank J. Wolber,
Petitioner,
177 vs.
Ford Motor Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold A. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clifford B. Longley and Mr. George T. Buckingham for the respondent.

William Cade,
Petitioner,
178 vs.
Catherine Holt, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. T. Armstrong for the petitioner.

The United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,
Petitioner,
179 vs.
John F. Guenther.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. M. Horn for the petitioner, and by Mr. James O. Bachman for the respondent.

John T. Burkett,
Petitioner,
180 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. W. House and Mr. C. H. Moses for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Howard T. Jones, and Mr. Morton P. Fisher for the respondent.

Griffith Henshaw, Executor, etc.,
Petitioner,
181 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen L. Chickering and Mr. Walter C. Fox, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John Vaughan Groner for the respondent.

The Greylock Mills,
Petitioner,
182 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sanford Robinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Millar E. McGilchrist for the respondent.

Tracy Waldron Fruit Company,
Petitioner,
185 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeals, First Appellate District, State of California, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. F. Caines for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henley C. Booth for the respondent.

Painless Parker Dentist,
Petitioner,
186 vs.
The People of the State of Colorado.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. S. Breitenstein for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles H. Haines for the respondent.

Judice Co., Incorporated, and
Louisiana Western Railroad Company,
Petitioners,
187 vs.
Village of Scott.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry McCall for the petitioners.

James C. Davis, Federal Agent,
Petitioner,
188 vs.
Mrs. Mary Preston, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. L. Cook and Mr. Sidney F. Andrews for the petitioner.

Nelson V. McMullen,
Petitioner,
189 vs.
W. D. Lewis, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Simms and Mr. Wm. Bullitt Dixon for the petitioner, and by Mr. George E. Price and Mr. Robert S. Spillman for the respondents.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
192 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William R. Harr and Mr. Charles H. Bates for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. George C. Butte, and Mr. Louis R. Mehlinger for the respondent.

Adrien Hebert,
Petitioner,
194 vs.
First National Bank of Abbeville.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. McCoy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Philip S. Pugh for the respondent.

Richard S. Woodliff,
Petitioner,
195 vs.
Citizens Building and Realty Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard S. Woodliff, pro se, and by Mr. Larry S. Davidow for the respondent.

Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
196 vs.
Rollin E. Talbert, Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. L. Bell, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. Luther Burns, Mr. Henry S. Conrad, Mr. L. E. Durham, and Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for the petitioner, and by Mr. Horace Guffin for the respondent.

The Public Service Commission of Indiana, et al.,
Petitioners,
197 vs.
The Vincennes Water Supply Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur L. Gilliom and Mr. James M. Ogden for the petitioners, and by Mr. Clyde H. Jones for the respondent.

The Aluminum Castings Company,
Petitioner,
198 vs.
Carl F. Routzahn, individually, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Scott for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Millar E. McGilchrist for the respondent.

The Frank Miller Company,
Petitioner,
201 vs.
The Bassick Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank S. Busser for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lynn A. Williams for the respondent.

Hubert Bosarge and Clarence Ladnier,
Petitioners,
202 vs.
The State of Alabama.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Alabama was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry H. Smith for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charlie C. McCall for the respondent.

The Monongahela West Penn Public Service Corporation,
Petitioner,
203 vs.
George Albey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence R. Pugh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roy M. Merryman for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
204 vs.
James Wheeler.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. White and Mr. Harry R. Stocker for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. H. Douglass for the respondent.

Fort Dodge, Des Moines & Southern Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Herbert Yarn.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James C. Davis and Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Donald Evans for the respondent.
205	
O. B. Morrisette, Petitioner, vs. Boulevard Bridge Corporation.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claudian B. Northrup for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. Randolph Williams for the respondent.
207	
Richmond Screw Anchor Co. (Inc.), Petitioner, vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. Ellery Edwards, Mr. Wm. Houston Kenyon, Mr. Archibald Cox, Mr. Joseph W. Cox, Mr. Douglas H. Kenyon, and Mr. F. M. Sheffield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. George C. Butte, and Mr. Henry A. Cox for the respondent.
208	
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. George Bush.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ashby M. Warren and Mr. Harold R. Small for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas T. Fauntleroy and Mr. P. H. Cullen for the respondent.
209	

City of Gainesville,
Petitioner,
210 vs.
Brown-Crummer Investment Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. O. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. John T. Suggs, Mr. James G. Martin, Mr. Rhodes S. Baker, Mr. Alex. F. Weisberg, and Mr. F. C. Dillard for the respondent.

Henry T. Read, by J. Harrington Edwards, Attorney in Fact,
Petitioner,
211 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Pierce for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Seth W. Richardson, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Perry G. Michener for the respondent.

New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
212 vs.
Donato Marcone, as Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert C. Wall for the petitioner.

Alice G. Kales,
Petitioner,
213 vs.
Fred L. Woodworth, individually, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hal H. Smith and Mr. Archibald Broomfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

United States of America, on the petition of Marinelli Rocco, etc., Petitioner,
214 vs.
Arthur J. Karnuth, District Director of Immigration, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Irving W. Cole for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondents.

Reynolds Mortgage Company, Petitioner,
215 vs.
Abraham Lincoln Life Insurance Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest May for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. H. Barwise for the respondent.

Emma Owens, Petitioner,
216 vs.
Juriman C. Hudson, as Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals, Eighth Judicial District, Cuyahoga County, State of Ohio, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander H. Martin for the petitioner, and by Mr. James C. Waters, Jr., for the respondent.

Det Forenede Dampskibs Selskab, Petitioner,
217 vs.
Insurance Company of North America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira A. Campbell for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the respondent.

Joseph Rosenberg and Isadore Rosenberg, copartners, etc., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

218

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nat Schmulowitz for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

John C. Lynch, as Receiver, etc., Petitioner, vs. International Banking Corporation.

219

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. A. DeLigne and Mr. A. E. Shaw for the petitioner, and by Mr. Marcel E. Cerf for the respondent.

General Electric Company and Ernst Stoffregen, Petitioners, vs. Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents.

220

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harrison F. Lyman, Mr. Frederick P. Fish, and Mr. Charles E. Tullar for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Harry E. Knight for the respondent.

Royal Baking Powder Company, Petitioner, vs. Federal Trade Commission, et al.

221

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Matthew E. O'Brien and Mr. Matthew H. O'Brien for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Robert E. Healy, Mr. Adrien F. Busick, and Mr. Martin A. Morrison for the respondents.

State of Missouri at the relation of Missouri Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
222 vs.
Frederick Gehner, as Assessor, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James C. Jones, Lon O. Hocker, Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, Mr. James C. Jones, Jr., and Mr. Ralph T. Finley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Julius T. Muench and Mr. Oliver Senti for the respondents.

Johnson-Wentworth Company,
Petitioner,
224 vs.
Joseph C. McDonough.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Neave for the petitioner, and by Mr. Amasa C. Paul for the respondent.

Arabella E. Bodkin,
Petitioner,
225 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. George C. Butte, and Mr. J. Robert Anderson for the respondent.

Thomas A. Early, Receiver, etc.
Petitioner,
226 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. E. Whiting for the petitioner, and by Mr. M. G. Wallace for the respondent.

Illinois Coal Corporation,
Petitioner,
227 vs.
American Mine Equipment Company, et al.;

Illinois Coal Corporation,
Petitioner,
228 vs.
American Mine Equipment Company, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. O. Levinson and Mr. Benjamin V. Becker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Silas H. Strawn, Mr. Lawrence T. Allen, Mr. Bertram F. Shipman, Mr. Gilbert E. Porter, and Mr. Edward K. Hanlon for the respondents.

District of Columbia,
Petitioner,
229 vs.
Charles H. Fred, alias Hamilton C.Fred.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Bride for the petitioner.

Texas Power & Light Company,
Petitioner,
230 vs.
Fairbanks Morse & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joe A. Worsham for the petitioner, and by Mr. B. L. Agerton for the respondent.

Texas Electric Service Company,
Petitioner,
231 vs.
Fairbanks Morse & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joe A. Worsham for the petitioner, and by Mr. B. L. Agerton for the respondent.

The Home Insurance Company, et al.
Petitioners,
232 vs.
C. J. Dick, Texas & Gulf Steamship Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David Ramsey and Mr. Mark W. Maclay for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. C. Hughes, Mr. John Neethe, and Mr. John L. Darrouzet for the respondents.

Ringling Trust & Savings Bank, et al.,
Petitioners,
233 vs.
Whitfield Estates, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert Sawyer for the petitioners, and by Mr. John C. Cooper and Mr. H. P. Adair for the respondent.

C. A. Marrs, et al.,
Petitioners,
234 vs.
The City of Oxford, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry W. Hart for the petitioners, and by Mr. W. A. Ayres, Mr. Austin M. Cowan, and Mr. Chester I. Long for the respondents.

Britain Steamship Company, Ltd.,
Petitioner,
236 vs.
Munson Steamship Line.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Hickox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark W. Maclay for the respondent.

American Sales Corporation,
Petitioner,
239 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. W. Gregory and Mr. James W. Wayman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
240 vs.
Harry W. Lutton.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Union C. DeFord, and Mr. Norman A. Emery for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Ruffalo for the respondent.

Navigazione Libera Triestina, S. A.,
Petitioner,
241 vs.
Robins Drydock & Repair Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. Curtis Rouse and Mr. Harold Harper for the respondent.

Transoceanica Societa Italiana Di Navigazione,
Petitioner,
242 vs.
Patent Vulcanite Roofing Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. Arthur W. Clement for the respondent.

Norman Lee Freeman, for himself, etc.,
Petitioner,
243 vs.
Timothy Nolan Hopkins.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Henry Longden for the petitioner.

John Lee Mahin,
Petitioner,
244 vs.
The Positype Corporation of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Caruthers Ewing for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. Randolph Hicks for the respondent.

Charles P. Howard and International Typographical Union, etc.,
Petitioners,
246 vs.
Walter J. Weissman, James F. Carr, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert N. Golding and Mr. Wymouth Kirkland for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank C. Dailey for the respondents.

Victorio Nogueira,
Petitioner,
248 vs.
The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Humphrey J. Lynch for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Gibbons and Mr. Edward R. Brumley for the respondent.

John G. Lonsdale,
Petitioner,
249 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert A. Littleton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
250 vs.
Ox Fibre Brush Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, and Mr. Morton P. Fisher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert L. Hopkins and Mr. Merritt Starr for the respondent.

Rockwood Corporation of St. Louis,
Petitioner,
251 vs.
Bricklayer's Local Union No. 1, of St. Louis, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mat J. Holland and Mr. George Eigel for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. J. Rowe and Mr. Thomas J. Rowe, Jr., for the respondent.

John Hirschi,
Petitioner,
252 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wade H. Ellis and Mr. Don F. Reed for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Lisle A. Smith for the respondent.

New Orleans Bank & Trust Company,
Petitioner,
253 vs.
Mike S. Hart, Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry P. Dart, Jr., for the petitioner.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
255 vs.
Emma Crouch, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. P. Waggener and Mr. J. M. Challiss for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. S. Salathiel for the respondent.

Charles H. Johnson,
Petitioner,
256 vs.
Mary M. McCloud, a Free Dealer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Giles J. Patterson for the petitioner, and by Mr. William E. Kay, Mr. Thomas B. Adams, and Mr. J. T. G. Crawford for the respondent.

Frances Perry,
Petitioner,
257 vs.
Capital Traction Company;
Lulu K. Perry,
Petitioner,
258 vs.
Capital Traction Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hyman M. Goldstein for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank J. Hogan and Mr. Edmund L. Jones for the respondent.

Eda Matthiessen,
Petitioner,
259 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. F. Gallagher and Mr. Samuel M. Rinaker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

Southern Surety Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
260 vs.
Commercial Casualty Insurance Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James L. Parrish and Mr. Donald Thompson for the petitioners, and by Mr. John M. Freeman for the respondents.

William Miller,
Petitioner,
261 vs.
H. J. McLaughlin, Secretary, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Henry Walter for the petitioner.

Osage County Motor Company,
Petitioner,
262 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles B. Wilson, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Seth W. Richardson, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Pedro Capo-Rodriguez for the respondent.

Emmons Coal Mining Corporation and The Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland,
Petitioners,
263 vs.
Sir R. Ropner & Company, Ltd.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. T. Manning, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. Alan Dawson and Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondent.

The State of Ohio ex rel. George B. Moock,
Petitioner,
264 vs.
The City of Cincinnati, et al.:
George B. Moock,
Petitioner,
265 vs.
The City of Cincinnati, etc., et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Province M. Pogue and Mr. Thomas L. Pogue for the petitioner, and by Mr. John D. Ellis, Mr. Ralph A. Kreimer, and Mr. William E. Hess for the respondents.

Sarah V. Thacker,
Petitioner,
266 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gardner K. Byers for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. W. Cammack and Mr. Samuel B. Kirby, Jr., for the respondent.

Andrew T. Matthew, Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner,
268 vs.
Union Central Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Andrew T. Matthew, pro se, and by Mr. F. Eldred Boland for the respondent.

The Henrietta Mills,
Petitioner,
270 vs.
Rutherford County, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Murray Allen for the petitioner.

Aktieselskabet Dampskib Gansfjord, Claimant, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 271

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John D. Grace for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Chicago Frog & Switch Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 272

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Karl D. Loos, Mr. E. Barrett Prettyman, and Mr. Preston B. Kavanaugh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

Kunglig Jarnvagsstyrelsen, also known as the Royal Administration of The Swedish State Railways, Petitioner, vs. Dexter & Carpenter (Inc.). 273

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Harry Covington, Mr. Edward B. Burling, Mr. Gastav Lange, Jr., and Mr. Newell W. Ellison for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles S. Haight for the respondent.

William T. Graff, Charles M. Graff, et al., Petitioners, vs. Victor H. Wallace, D. Irving Coakley, et al. 274

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry S. Barger and Mr. Frank Stetson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Victor H. Wallace for the respondents.

Vesta Battery Corporation,
Petitioner,
275 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. Morris for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. R. C. Williamson for the respondent.

Cady, Schapiro & Schapiro, et al.,
Petitioners,
277 vs.
M. D. Mirsky & Co. (Inc.), Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David Haar for the petitioners, and by Mr. David W. Kahn for the respondent.

The Cracker Jack Co.,
Petitioner,
278 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Holmes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. George C. Butte, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

The Cracker Jack Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
279 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Holmes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. George C. Butte, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

The Shotwell Mfg. Co.,
Petitioner,
280 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Holmes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. George C. Butte, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

Peter A. Lorenz, et al.,
Petitioners,
283 vs.
James S. Mabon, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. H. Watkins and Mr. W. Lee Guice for the petitioners, and by Mr. Benjamin B. Taylor, Mr. C. V. Porter, and Mr. Joseph A. Loret, for the respondents.

Clyde A. Davis, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
284 vs.
Charles R. Mabee, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Ritter, Mr. D. F. Melhorne, and Mr. E. J. Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. James H. Boyd and Mr. Charles A. Thatcher, pro se.

G. C. Abernathy, Administrator, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
285 vs.
State of Oklahoma ex rel. A. W. Goar, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Tomerlin, Mr. C. B. Stuart, and Mr. Stephen Chandler for the petitioner.

The Hoosier Casualty Co.,
Petitioner,
286 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert A. Littleton and Mr. W. W. Spaulding for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

Abner Francis Dodd,
Petitioner,
287 vs.
Union Indemnity Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hiram M. Smith for the petitioner and by Mr. Frank H. Atwill for the respondent.

Calvin Pardee, et al.,
Petitioners,
288 vs.
William H. Howcott, et al.;
The Pardee Company,
Petitioner,
289 vs.
William H. Howcott, et al.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John May and Mr. Russell Duane for the petitioners, and by Mr. William Winans Wall and Mr. Hugh S. Suthon for the respondents.

Isaac L. Rosenstein, et al.,
Petitioners,
290 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David P. Siegel for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Clinton Corn Syrup Refining Co., Petitioner,
291 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard S. Doyle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. R. C. Williamson for the respondent.

National Candy Co., Petitioner,
292 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard S. Doyle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. R. C. Williamson for the respondent.

Fort Dodge, Des Moines & Southern R. R. Co., Petitioner,
293 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. E. Lee Marshall and Mr. James W. Carmalt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Lisle A. Smith for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., Petitioner,
297 vs.
Fernia Koonse, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Merritt U. Hayden and Mr. Edward J. White for the petitioner, and by Mr. David W. Hill for the respondent.

S. Naitove & Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
298 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Caulsen, Mr. R. Kemp Slaughter, and Mr. Hugh C. Bickford for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Bickett Coal & Coke Co.,
Petitioner,
299 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jerry A. Mathews, Mr. Josephus C. Trimble, and Mr. Horace S. Whitman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. J. Robert Anderson for the respondent.

Quapaw Land Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
300 vs.
S. H. Bolinger.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. W. Clements and Mr. S. L. Herold for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank J. Looney and Mr. J. M. Grimmet for the respondent.

Abbie Conner, et al.,
Petitioners,
302 vs.
Herman D. Cornell, Executor, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Neff for the petitioners, and by Mr. W. H. Francis, Mr. John Rogers, and Mr. Leonard O. Lytle for the respondent.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company,
Petitioner,
303 vs.
Mabel C. Toops, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred A. Scott, Mr. E. E. McInnis, and Mr. Alfred G. Armstrong for the petitioner, and by Mr. Carr W. Taylor for the respondent.

The Pratt Chuck Company,
Petitioner,
304 vs.
Crescent Insulated Wire and Cable Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert B. Honeyman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Allen S. Hubbard for the respondent.

Franc-Strohmenger & Cowan, Inc.,
Petitioner,
305 vs.
Baro Forchheimer, doing business, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Holland S. Duell, Mr. Clifford E. Dunn, Mr. Frederick P. Fish, and Mr. Charles Neave for the petitioner.

May Cook,
Petitioner,
306 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen W. Comstock for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Edwin A. Krauthoff,
Petitioner,
308 vs.
The Kansas City Joint Stock Land Bank of Kansas City, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin A. Krauthoff and Mr. Price Wickersham for the petitioner, and by Mr. Cyrus Crane and Mr. E. F. Halstead for the respondents.

Sara H. Ross, Executrix, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
310 vs.
J. L. White, Trustee, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Pitts and Mr. E. W. Ross for the petitioners, and by Mr. C. E. Pigford for the respondents.

Walter A. May, et al., executors, etc.,
Petitioners,
311 vs.
D. B. Hainer, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Sachs for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

Louis Clements, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
312 vs.
Fred I. Conyers, Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William M. Acton and Mr. T. Morton McDonald for the petitioner, and by Mr. Isidor Kahn for the respondent.

The Boston and Maine Railroad,
Petitioner,
313 vs.
Arthur J. Watkins.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Hampshire was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William N. Rogers for the petitioner, and by Mr. John E. Benton for the respondent.

Niles Bement Pond Co.,
Petitioner,
314 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Karl D. Loos, Mr. E. Barrett Prettyman, and Mr. Preston B. Kavanagh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. R. C. Williamson for the respondent.

Universal Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
315 vs.
Gulf Refining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. Roger Englar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Van Vechten Veeder for the respondent.

Jack Murphy,
Petitioner,
316 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Gray for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Pacific Improvement Company,
Petitioner,
317 vs.
The Pittsburgh Shawmut and Northern Railway Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Adelbert Moot and Mr. John G. Buchanan for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Merrill Wright and Mr. Edwin E. Tait for the respondents.

Ostrander-Seymour Company,
Petitioner,
318 vs.
Grand Rapids Electrotype Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stuart E. Knappen and Mr. Meyer Abrams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ben M. Corwin for the respondent.

John L. Burke, et al.,
Petitioners,
319 vs.
The Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Zane for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edmond D. Adcock and Mr. James M. Sheean for the respondents.

Charles L. Apfel, et al.,
Petitioners,
320 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District ofColumbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Vernon E. West for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, Mr. Walter Wyatt, and Mr. Newton D. Baker for the respondents.

August Aschenbach,
Petitioner,
321 vs.
Sullivan Mining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Williams for the petitioner and by Mr. Frank T. Post for the respondent.

Huber Hoge, Inc.,
Petitioner,
322 vs.
Smith & Wesson, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred Bennett and Mr. Powell Crichton for the petitioner and by Mr. Robert C. Cooley for the respondent.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
323 vs.
Kansas City Structural Steel Company;

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
324 vs.
Kansas City Structural Steel Company.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Randolph C. Shaw for the petitioner, and by Mr. Armwell L. Cooper for the respondent.

H. G. Richardson,
Petitioner,
325 vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ike W. Crabtree for the petitioner, and by Mr. John B. Keeble and Mr. Henry J. Livingston for the respondent.

Blackmore Investment Company,
Petitioner,
327 vs.
Axel A. Johnson, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Grove J. Fink for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert H. Elliot for the respondents.

Joseph W. Cline, et al.,
Petitioners,
328 vs.
J. S.Cosden, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. L. Davidson, Mr. W. I. Williams, and Mr. Nathan Newby for the petitioners, and by Mr. James C. Denton and Mr. Henry M. Gray for the respondents.

Good Springs Anchor Company, et al., Petitioners,
329 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph W. Smith for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

Fred Philipps, Petitioner,
330 vs.
Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. M. Miner and Mr. M. H. Boutelle for the petitioner, and by Mr. William T. Faricy and Mr. Samuel H. Cady for the respondent.

Southern California Utilities, Inc., Petitioner,
331 vs.
City of Huntington Park, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul Overton for the petitioner, and by Mr. William E.Evans for the respondents.

J. T. Hurley and J. T. Fleishel, Trustees, etc., Petitioners,
332 vs.
Illinois Power & Light Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter H. Saunders, Mr. John S. Leahy, and Mr. Robert Stone for the petitioners, and by Mr. Thomas F. Doran and Mr. T. M. Pierce for the respondent.

Thomas S. Dugan,
Petitioner,
333 vs.
M. M. Logan, J. A. Siedel, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. O. Stanley for the petitioner, and by Mr. M. M. Logan and Mr. John L. Stout for the respondents.

The Becker Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
334 vs.
William Snyder by his next friend Albert Snyder.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick L. Leckie, Mr. S. H. Holding, and Mr. Tracy H. Duncan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Luther Day for the respondent.

William Habermel, Trustee,
Petitioner,
335 vs.
E. B. Mong, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gardner K. Byers and Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles M. Seymour for the respondents.

Southern California Edison Company,
Petitioner,
337 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roy V. Reppy, Mr. W. C. Mallendore, and Mr. E. W. Cunningham for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur T. George and Mr. W. B. Mathews for the respondents.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
340 vs.
Nelson B. Updike, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes and Mr. Sewall Key for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis A. Brogan, Mr. Alfred G. Ellick, and Mr. Anon Raymond for the respondents.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
342 vs.
Alma Kane, as Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. N. Whitlock for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. Lowndes Maury for the respondent.

Charles A. Corliss,
Petitioner,
344 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, as Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Hartfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Randolph C. Shaw, and Mr. F. W. Dewart for the respondent.

United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, etc.,
Petitioner,
345 vs.
P. LeRoy Harwood, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Chauncey G. Parker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick H. Wood and Mr. Herbert B. Lee for the respondent.

Security Trust Company, South Side Bank & Trust Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. Ben S. Baer.

346

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Max Isaac for the petitioners, and Mr. J. Bernard Handlan and Mr. Charles J. Schuck for the respondent.

Ohio Clover Leaf Dairy Company, Petitioner, vs. Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

348

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry J. Gerrity and Mr. E. J. Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

Simmons Company, Petitioner, vs. Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

354

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Phillips Ketchum for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Allin H. Pierce for the respondent.

Royal Leikin and Moe Lieberman, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

355

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Cameron for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lehring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. The Pilliod Lumber Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes and Mr. Sewall Key for the petitioner, and by Mr. Herbert W. Nauts for the respondent.
356	
Emil Hansen, permanent receiver, etc., Petitioner, vs. E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Company, Inc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Catesby Jones and Mr. James W. Ryan for the petitioner, and by Mr. George H. Bond and Mr. William H. Button for the respondent.
358	
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Burr S. Stottle, Administrator, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. P. Littlepage, Mr. M. L. Bell, Mr. Luther Burns, Mr. Henry S. Conrad, Mr. Lisbon E. Durham, and Mr. W. F. Dickinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. John H. Atwood, Mr. Price Wickersham, and Mr. Oscar S. Hill for the respondent.
359	
Behn, Meyer & Company, Limited, Petitioner, vs. Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, et al; Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, et al., Petitioners, vs. Behn, Meyer & Company, Limited.	The petitions for writs of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert, Mr. J. Harry Covington, and Mr. Mahlon B. Doing for the petitioner in No. 360, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent in No. 360 and for the petitioner in No. 371.
360	
371	

Federal Electric Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
361 vs.
Flexlume Corporation;
Chicago Miniature Lamp Works, et al.
Petitioners,
362 vs.
Flexlume Corporation.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence E. Mehlhope and Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the petitioners, and by Mr. Wallace R. Lane and Mr. John S. Powers for the respondent.

Georgia Power Company,
Petitioner,
363 vs.
City of Decatur.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter T. Colquitt and Mr. Ben J. Conyers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hooper Alexander for the respondent.

Henry Escher, Ancillary Administrator, etc.,
Petitioners,
365 vs.
Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Spier Whitaker and Mr. Lyttleton Fox for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parnum, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Henry A. Cox for the respondent.

Symington-Anderson Company,
Petitioner,
366 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. Kemp Slaughter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes and Mr. Sewall Key for the respondent.

Yellow Motor Company of St. Louis,
Petitioner,
367 vs.
William Broderick and Irene Broderick, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lon O. Hocker for the petitioner.

Wilton McCarthy,
Petitioner,
368 vs.
United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Casper Schenk and Mr. W. B. Sloan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jesse A. Miller and Mr. James C. Davis for the respondent.

Uniform Printing & Supply Company.
Petitioner,
369 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter H. Eckert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Barnam R. Gary for the respondent.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
370 vs.
Western Meat Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Robert E. Healy, Mr. Alfred M. Craven, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward I. Barry and Mr. Frank L. Horton for the respondents.

The City of Cincinnati, Petitioner, 372 vs. Margaret W. Vester; The City of Cincinnati, Petitioner, 373 vs. James S. Richards, et al.; The City of Cincinnati, Petitioner, 374 vs. Llewellyn B. Reakirt.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John D. Ellis and Mr. Ed. F. Alexander for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Weld Peck and Mr. Milton Sayler for the respondents.
Western Cartridge Company, Petitioner, 375 vs. Louis L. Emmerson, Secretary of State of the State of Illinois.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Colin C. H. Fyffe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom and Mr. Bayard Lacey Catron for the respondent.
The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, 376 vs. A. L. Garrett, as Administrator, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas S. Buzbee, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, and Mr. George B. Pugh for the petitioner, and by Mr. William R. Donham for the respondent.

Remington Rand, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue;	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick H. Wood and Mr. Joseph C. White for the petitioner,
377	
Remington Rand, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe for the respondent.
378	

Hyman Polski, Charles Geller, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Howard Morphy for
379	

the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

North River Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Edmond Becnel, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walker B. Spencer for
380	

the petitioner, and by Mr. A. A. Moreno for the respondents.

Swift & Company, Petitioner, vs. American Transportation Company, et al.;	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Hickox for the petitioners, and by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the respondents.
381	
Armour & Company, Petitioner, vs. American Transportation Company, et al.;	
382	
Wilson & Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. American Transportation Company, et al.	
383	

Tommie Hill and A. W. Karns,
Petitioners,
384 vs.
The United States of America;
Madge Hill Karns,
Petitioner,
385 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert B. Keenan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch and Mr. M. D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Inez M. Jamison, et al.,
Petitioners,
390 vs.
Valentine Encarnacion.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. Henney and Mr. Daniel Miner for the petitioners, and by Mr. William S. Butler and Mr. James A. Gray for the respondent.

Carl F. Bogelmann,
Petitioner,
393 vs.
Steamer "Roseway," James F. Quinn.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Curtis Rouse for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward L. Logan and Mr. Warner Fyne for the respondent.

Charter Shipping Company, Ltd.,
Petitioner,
397 vs.
Bowring, Jones & Tidy, Ltd.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cletus Keating for the petitioner, and by Mr. Theodore L. Bailey for the respondent.

The Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company,

Petitioner,

401 vs.

The Wheeling & Lake Erie Railway Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. F. Taplin for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Boyd, Mr. Andrew P. Martin, Mr. H. H. McKeehan, and Mr. George William Cottrell for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Abbot P. Mills, It is ordered that Paul Z. Hodge, Esquire, of Niles, State of Ohio, Jas. E. Bennett, Oscar E. Diser, and Charles M. Wilkins, Esquires, of Youngstown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Nugent, It is ordered that Dean Lake Traxler and Millard B. Kennedy, Esquires, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Offutt, It is ordered that Ross H. Snyder, Esquire, of Chevy Chase, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer Hall, It is ordered that Eugene McCaffrey, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that Cecil Shane, Esquire, of Blytheville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer Thomas, It is ordered that Robert W. Simons, Esquire, of Enid, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, It is ordered that Charles A. Russell, Esquire, of Missoula, State of Montana, and Robert E. Mulroney, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Driscoll, It is ordered that Daniel H. Carragher, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that James O'Connor Roberts, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, It is ordered that William R. Murrin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Sisson, It is ordered that William D. L. Starbuck, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. C. Gibson, It is ordered that Nelle L. Ingels, of Greenville, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Frank Herbert McGregor, Esquire, of Amarillo, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, It is ordered that Almon Ray Smith, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ira L. Ewers, It is ordered that Hugh Montgomery, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis L. Korn, It is ordered that Harry M. Andrews, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Peter Q. Nyce, It is ordered that John D. Fredericks, Jr., Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. J. Peterson, It is ordered that Raymond T. Coughlin, Esquire, of Sacramento, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, It is ordered that John Frank Martin, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Sanitary Refrigerator Co., Petitioner, vs. Alexander F. Winters and Basil R. Crampton. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Alexander F. Winters and Basil R. Crampton,
Petitioners,
14 vs.
Dent Hardware Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Raul Rogerio Gonzalez, by his Guardian ad litem, Leon Gonzalez,
Petitioner,
6 vs.
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Manila.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Alfred Klesner, Doing Business Under the Name "Shade Shop," Hooper & Klesner. On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

8

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The Macallen Company, Appellant, vs. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

578, October Term, 1928.

The motions presented on behalf of the American Bankers Association and on behalf of the Massachusetts National Bank Association for leave to file briefs, as amici curiae, in support of the petition for a rehearing in this cause, are granted.

The Court has considered these two briefs, and also the four briefs heretofore permitted to be filed by the States of California, Washington, Oregon and New York, as friends of the Court. After consideration of these briefs, and of the petition for a rehearing of this cause filed by the State of Massachusetts, such petition for a rehearing is denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of the Federal Radio Commission, Petitioner.
——— Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus and/or prohibition,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, set down for hearing with the case of Federal Radio Commission vs. General Electric Company and People of the State of New York, No. 122, October Term, 1929. The parties are directed to file briefs on the question of what the power of this Court is in respect to the issue of a writ of mandamus or a writ of prohibition in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Radio Commission,
Petitioner,
122 vs.
General Electric Company and People of the State of New York.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the Matter of Northern Pacific Railway Company, Great Northern Railway Company, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners,
——— Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus, and the motion for leave to amend and supplement such petition,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that cause be shown by the Honorable George M. Bourquin, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana, and the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana, in printed form, returnable on the first motion day following a period of thirty days from this date, why a writ of mandamus should not issue out of this Court requiring them to annul and set aside the order and decree of May 31, 1929, dismissing the petitioners' bill of complaint.

And it is further ordered that cause be shown by the Honorable Charles N. Pray, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana, and the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana, in printed form, returnable on the first motion day following a period of thirty days from this date, why a writ of mandamus should not issue out of this Court requiring them to call to their assistance two other Federal Judges as provided by section 266 of the Judicial Code, as amended, (Title 28, section 380 of the United States Code) to hear and determine the petitioners' application for an interlocutory injunction in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant, vs. The City of New York.

18 Original.

On consideration of the motion for the appointment of a special master in this cause.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that the Honorable Edward K. Campbell be, and he is hereby, appointed special master in this cause, with power to summons witnesses, issue subpoenas, and to take such testimony as may be introduced and such as he may desire to call. The master is directed to make findings of fact and conclusions of law, and to submit the same to this Court with all convenient speed, together with his recommendations for a decree. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the master shall be subject to consideration, revision, or approval by the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hugh W. Grant, Receiver of the Struthers Furnace Company, Petitioner, vs. A. B. Leach & Company, Inc.

9

On consideration of the motion of Hugh W. Grant, as Trustee in Bankruptcy, to intervene in this cause as a party petitioner,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Nevada, Complainant, vs. Crown Willamette Paper Company.

4 Original.

On consideration of the stipulation to continue filed by the parties herein,

It is now here ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued to the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Behn, Meyer & Company, Ltd., Petitioner,
360 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for respondent in case No. 371 for leave to file a brief opposing the granting of a writ of certiorari in the above entitled cause,

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jennie V. David, Petitioner,
190 vs.
Thomas D. Hubbard, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of William L. David, Bankrupt.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jennie V. David, Petitioner,
190 vs.
Thomas D. Hubbard, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of William L. David, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William L. David, Petitioner,
191 vs.
Thomas D. Hubbard, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of William L. David, Bankrupt.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William L. David, Petitioner,
191 vs.
Thomas D. Hubbard, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of William L. David, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert G. Meadows, Petitioner,
269 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that the Clerk shall cause the record to be printed in this case, the cost thereof and the clerk's costs already incurred, and such as may hereafter properly be incurred, to be paid from the special fund in the custody of the Clerk, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anthony Brown, Eddie Stokes, Walter E. Burke, et al., Petitioners,
388 vs.
State of California.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anthony Brown, Eddie Stokes, Walter E. Burke, et al., Petitioners,
388 vs.
State of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company, Petitioner,
87 vs.
Lula Carroll, Administratrix of the Estate of Guerney O. Burtch, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana is granted, with the limitation, however, that counsel shall confine themselves, in the briefs and in oral argument, to the question whether this suit is barred by the statute of limitations. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Royal Insurance Company, Ltd., et al., Petitioners,
123 vs.
United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. The question arising in this case is related to the questions presented in three other cases now before the Court on writs of certiorari, and for that reason this case is advanced and set down to be heard with the related causes. It is therefore ordered that the four related cases shall be heard in the following order: first, Nos. 32 and 5, to be heard together as one case when No. 32 is reached in the regular call of the docket; second, No. 123, to be argued separately immediately after the argument of Nos. 32 and 5; third, No. 56 to be heard separately after the conclusion of the argument in No. 123.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Employer's Liability Assurance Corporation. Ltd. of London, England, Petitioner,
81 vs.
Mrs. Myrtis Cook, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Texas and Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
89 vs.
Mrs. Wallace Guidry, Administratrix of the Estate of Wallace Guidry, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, 6th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
92 vs.
North Texas Lumber Company.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anita H. Cooper, Petitioner,
93 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
99 vs.
Guy C. Earl.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frederick C. Renziehausen, Petitioner,	Order allowing certiorari.
114 vs.	The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered

that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Florsheim Brothers Drygoods Co., Ltd., Petitioner,	Order allowing certiorari.
118 vs.	The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit
The United States of America.	Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered

that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Universal Battery Company, Petitioner,	Order allowing certiorari.
127 vs.	The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted.
The United States.	And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the

proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States, Petitioner,	Order allowing certiorari.
128 vs.	The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit
American Can Company.	Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered

that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,

Petitioner,

129 vs.

Missouri Can Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,

Petitioner,

130 vs.

Detroit Can Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Second National Bank of Saginaw, Saginaw, Michigan, Trustee of the Estate of Wellington R. Burt, deceased.

Petitioner,

72 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur E. Colgate, Administrator of the
estate of Clinton G. Colgate, deceased, On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioner, to the Court of Claims.
74 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Dampskibsselskabet Norden, On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioner, to the Court of Claims.
76 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Piedmont Grocery Company, On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioner, to the Court of Claims.
78 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

E. J. Kelly,

Petitioner,

80 vs.

F. E. Watkins, Paul S. Cotner and Milo D. Watkins, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William M. Abbott,

Petitioner,

82 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Higginbotham-Bailey-Logan Company, Graham-Brown Shoe Company and Monnig Dry Goods Company,

Petitioners,

83 vs.

International Shoe Company (Peters Branch), and E. T. Duff, Receiver-Trustee, etc., et al.

On petititon for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Benjamin Rogers,

Petitioner,

84 vs.

Canadian National Railway Company, a Foreign Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hugh Wilhite, W. N. Pittman, Harris L. Moore, Trustees under the will of Wm. Stone Woods, deceased,

Petitioners,

85 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. S. Foster,

Petitioner,

88 vs.

Alabama Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John F. Sherry,
Petitioner,
94 vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Compagnie Generale Transatlantique,
Petitioner,
95 vs.
The American Tobacco Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

County of Gallatin, J. S. Taylor, as Treasurer, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
96 vs.
Yellowstone Park Transportation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Minetta G. Cutting,

Petitioner,

97 vs.

Mahlon R. Bryan, Spencer K. Mulford, Spencer K. Mulford, Jr., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Annie S. Jones, as Administratrix of the estate of John F. Sawyer, deceased,

Petitioner,

100 vs.

Parnell Whaley, as Administratrix of the estate of V. T. Whaley, deceased and O. B. Riley.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wilbert J. McCloskey, Trading as The McCloskey Torch Company,

Petitioner,

101 vs.

The Toledo Pressed Steel Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Francis C. McDonald, et al., Petitioners, vs. State of Louisiana ex rel. Dema Realty Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

102

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Percy Jay Fuller, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

103

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Morgan, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

105

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Hust, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

106

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Prendergast, Petitioner, vs. Silverado Steamship Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

107

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frederick J. Mohr and Walter R. Mohr, Executors and Trustees of the last will of Fred Mohr, Jr., et al., Petitioners, vs. A. Bruce Bielaski, Trustee of Joseph M. Byrne, et al., etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

108

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wilson Banking Company,
Petitioner,
109 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pauline V. Beyer, doing business as Portland Hotel,
Petitioner,
110 vs.
Harold M. Smith.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The H. Kobacker & Sons Company,
Petitioner,
111 vs.
Norwich Union Indemnity Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Guaranty Trust Company of New York
and William J. Robb, Jr., as Executors of the Last Will and Testament of William J. Robb, Deceased, Petitioners,
112 vs.
Noxon Chemical Products Company, Inc., Ralph Nottebaum, Sr., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Loewer Realty Company,
Petitioner,
116 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International-Great-Northern Railroad Company and American Bonding Company of Baltimore,
Petitioners,
117 vs.
W. A. Hailey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals 10th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 10th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Galveston Dry Dock & Construction Company,
Petitioner,
120 vs.
United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Clark and Clark Car Company, a Corporation of the State of Pennsylvania,
Petitioners,
121 vs.
Frank J. Lanahan and Clark Car Company, a Corporation of the State of New Jersey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National City Bank,
Petitioner,
124 vs.
Edward Carter.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Sidney B. Sligh. 125

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. E. Thomas, Petitioner, vs. Jay Gates, Trustee. 126

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William P. Whitaker, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 131

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Joseph McCann,
Petitioner,
132 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ralph W. Harbison,
Petitioner,
134 vs.
C. C. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Hudson Brooks,
Petitioner,
135 vs.
C. C. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James E. Lewis,

Petitioner,

136 vs.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lee C. Morganroth,

Petitioner,

137 vs.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry William Croft,

Petitioner,

138 vs.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Raymond Willey,

Petitioner,

139 vs.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Walker,

Petitioner,

140 vs.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. H. Youngman,

Petitioner,

141 vs.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Otto M. Reif,

Petitioner,

142 vs.

C. C. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elizabeth W. Pontefract,

Petitioner,

143 vs.

C. C. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Albert Harbison,

Petitioner,

144 vs.

C. C. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emma J. Harbison,

Petitioner,

145 vs.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nin McQuillen,

Petitioner,

146 vs.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kenneth Seaver,

Petitioner,

147 vs.

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

P. R. Hilleman,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

148 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

C. G. Lewellyn, Formerly Collector of of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third

District of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Montgomery Cotton Mills, Inc.,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

150 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ward Baking Corporation,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

151 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paul G. Huckins,
Petitioner,
152 vs.
Willis B. Smith, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Richard J. Gatling, a Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States ex rel. American Silver Producers Association, a corporation, et al.,
Petitioners,
153 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury and Robert J. Grant, Director of the Mint.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Surety Company of New York, a Corporation,
Petitioner,
154 vs.
Blount County Bank, a Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

R. P. Shick, Assignee of Walter C. Roland,

Petitioner,

155 vs.

W. A. Goodman, Trustee of H. M. Albright.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Abe Schefman and Frank Schefman, doing business as Abe Schefman & Company.

Petitioners,

156 vs.

Edward De Groot, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Henry Bosscher and Robert Westveld, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Trinidad Asphalt Manufacturing Company,

Petitioner,

157 vs.

Western Willite Company and The Southern Surety Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland,

Petitioner,

158 vs.

I. Townsend Burden.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland,

Petitioner,

159 vs.

I. Townsend Burden.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Gill,

Petitioner,

160 vs.

Norma M. Smith, Administratrix of the Estate of Luke W. Smith, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jonesboro Grocer Company, a Corporation,
Petitioner,
161 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph A. Gamble, as Receiver of the England National Bank of Little Rock,
Petitioner,
162 vs.
F. Kamer Darragh.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Julius Rosenwald,
Petitioner,
430 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested;

Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emil Hansen, permanent receiver, etc., Petitioner,
358 vs.
E. I. DuPont De Nemours & Company, Inc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. J. Frank Staley in behalf of counsel for the petitioner, ~~in that behalf,~~ leave was granted to file reply brief of the petitioner, in this cause.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Charles F. Hobbs, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Kansas, et al., Petitioners,
20 Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the reply of the petitioners to the return to the rule to show cause and reply to respondent's opposition to petitioners' reply,

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Charles F. Hobbs, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Kansas, et al., Petitioners,
20 Original.

The motion for the appointment of a commissioner in this case, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Peter Q. Nyce in behalf of counsel for the petitioners.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Charles F. Hobbs, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Kansas, et al., Petitioners,
20 Original.

The motion for leave to file brief of the respondent in opposition to the petitioners' reply to the return to the rule to show cause and motion for the appointment of a commissioner in this case, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Offutt in behalf of counsel for the respondent.

George F. Henggeler, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
399 vs.
Arthur B. Allen, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. H. Stanley Hinrichs, in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of Matthew A. Hall and Raymond C. Young, as amici curiae, in this cause.

G. C. Abernathy, Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
285 vs.
State of Oklahoma ex rel. A. W. Goar, et al.

On consideration of the motion to defer the consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari for two weeks in this cause,
It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Texas, ex rel. T. H. Isensee, R. Morgan, J. S. Byerly, et al., Appellants,
245 vs.
Dee Sims, D. C. Cryor, I. S. York, et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the statement of appellees opposing jurisdiction out of time in this cause,
It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,
17 Original. vs.
The State of New York and the City of New York.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file an amended answer and to withdraw the answer previously filed in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Oklahoma, Complainant, 6 Original. vs. State of Texas, The United States of America, intervener.	The report of the commissioner of survey along the one hundredth meridian and report of work done, time employed, and expenses incurred by the commissioner in this case, was presented to the consideration of the Court.
Lavaughn Booth, formerly Lavaughn Clapp, et al., Appellants, 169 vs. William Clapp, Jr., et al.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jonathan Taylor for the appellants.
Joe Troche, Appellant, 247 vs. The People of the State of California.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roland Bessey for the appellant.
The United States of America, Appellant, 66 vs. Harry M. Wurzbach.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Alfred A. Wheat, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the appellant.
Hawkeye Stages, Incorporated, Appellant, 69 vs. Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of Iowa, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Halloran for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. John Fletcher, Mr. Maxwell A. O'Brien, Mr. J. H. Henderson, and Mr. Stephen Robinson for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

Arthur E. Colgate, Administrator, etc., Appellant,
74 vs.
The United States.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. King, Mr. Louis Titus, and Mr. C. Bascom Slemp for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

Carley & Hamilton, Inc., et al., Appellants,
86 vs.
Frank G. Snook, as Chief of the Division of Motor Vehicles, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin C. Ewing, Mr. W. R. Crawford, and Mr. J. F. Vizzard for the appellants.

James S. Harrington, et al., Appellants,
90 vs.
James Sloan.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wymer Dressler and Mr. Robert D. Neely for the appellants.

William J. Stratton, Secretary, etc., Appellant,
98 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom and Mr. B. L. Catron for the appellant.

National Fire Insurance Company of Hartford, Appellant,
104 vs.
Joseph B. Thompson, Superintendent, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William S. Hogsett, Mr. Ashley Cockrill, Mr. John S. Leahy, and Mr. Robert J. Folonie for the appellant.

Lena M. Jones, Appellant,
115 vs.
Consolidated Wagon and Machine Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilson S. Wiley for the appellant.

Mrs. Lessie Vada Gandy, et al., Appellants, vs. Louisiana Oil Refining Corporation, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. H. Randolph for the appellants.
119	
Piedmont and Northern Railway Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. S. O'B. Robinson, Jr., Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Mr. H. B. Haynsworth, and Mr. John E. Benton for the appellants.
164	
The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway and Western & Atlantic Railroad, Appellants, vs. Mrs. Clyde Morgan, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall and Mr. Frank Slemons for the appellants.
165	
The Hanover Fire Insurance Company of New York, Appellant, vs. Max Speckter, Abram Larner, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry A. Craig for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. William A. Gray for the appellees in opposition thereto.
167	
Lavaughn Booth, formerly Lavaughn Clapp, et al., Appellants, vs. William Clapp, Jr., et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jonathan Taylor for the appellantA
169	

Central National Bank of Lynn, Appellant, 173 vs. City of Lynn.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Hunt for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Wm. Harold Hitchcock for the appellee in opposition thereto.
Tremont Lumber Company, Appellant, 183 vs. The Police Jury of the Parish of Winn, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Theus for the appellant.
D. S. Murphey, Appellant, 184 vs. The Corporation Commission of the State of North Carolina.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. A. Jones for the appellant.
Charles M.Workman, Appellant, 199 vs. K. E. Boone and W. S. Kingsbury, Surveyor General, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert M. Clarke, Mr. Don G. Bowker, Mr. Arthur R. Smiley, Mr. Alexander T. Sokolow, and Mr. Henry S. Mackay, Jr., for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. David R. Faries for the appellees in opposition thereto.
Charles M. Workman, Katherine Irene Workman, et al., Appellants, 200 vs. K. E. Boone and W.S. Kingsbury, Surveyor General, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert M. Clarke, Mr. Don G. Bowker, Mr. Arthur M. Smiley, Mr. Alexander T. Sokolow, and Mr. Henry S. Mackay, Jr., for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. David R. Faries for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Allen & Reed, Inc., Appellant, vs. Walter A. Presbrey, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Moss for the appellant.
206	
State of Missouri at the relation of Missouri Insurance Company, Appellant, vs. Frederick Gehner, as Assessor, etc., et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Lon O. Hocker, Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, Mr. James C. Jones, Jr., and Mr. Ralph T. Finley for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Julius T. Muench and Mr. Oliver Senti for the appellees in opposition thereto.
222	
The Home Insurance Company, et al., Appellants, vs. C. J. Dick, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David Rumsey and Mr. Mark W. Maclay for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. H. C. Hughes and Mr. John Neethe for the appellees in opposition thereto.
232	
J. L. Morgan, Appellant, vs. The State of Georgia.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. R. Jackson for the appellant.
235	
State of Ohio ex rel. E. H. Bryant, Appellant, vs. Akron Metropolitan Park District, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick A. Henry and Mr. George D. Hile for the appellant.
237	
State of Ohio ex rel. Pauline Wadsworth, Appellant, vs. John A. Zangerle, Auditor, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick A. Henry and Mr. George D. Hile for the appellant.
238	

State of Texas, ex rel., T. H. Isensee, et al., Appellants, vs. Dee Sims, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Barry Mohun and Mr. Edward R. Kleberg for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Claude V. Birkhead for the appellees in opposition thereto.
245	
Joe Troche, Appellant, vs. The People of the State of California.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roland Beesey for the appellant.
247	
New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, Appellant, vs. The State Board of Taxes, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frankland Briggs and Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the appellant.
254	
Geo. T. Cuttingham and William C. Menginnes, doing business, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Frank C. Snook, as Chief of Division of Motor Vehicles, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. R. Crawford and Mr. Henry C. Hotchkiss for the appellants.
267	
Memphis & Charleston Railway Company, Appellant, vs. C. L. Pace, G. C. Stephens.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. John B. Hyde, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the appellant.
276	

The United States of America, Appellant, 281 vs. D. D. Adams.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the appellant.
The United States of America, Appellant, 282 vs. D. D. Adams.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the appellant.
Peter Muselin, Appellant, 294 vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Tom Zima, Appellant, 295 vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Milan Resetar, Appellant, 296 vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas M. Henry for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. John C. Frazer for the appellee in opposition thereto.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, et al., etc., Appellants, 301 vs. W. C. Maxcy, as Receiver, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Reynolds for the appellants.

The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company, Appellant, vs. Phoenix Indemnity Co.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the appellant.
307	
Exchange Drug Company, Appellant, vs. Henry S. Long, as Chairman, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. B. Evins for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Charlie C. McCall and Mr. Richard T. Rives for the appellees in opposition thereto.
309	
J. Du Pratt White, Franklin W. Hopkins, et al., Appellants, vs. Sparkill Realty Corporation, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter H. Pollak for the appellants.
336	
Frank H. Dohany, Appellant, vs. Frank F. Rogers, State Highway Commissioner, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank H. Dohany, pro se.
338	
Columbus & Greenville Railway Company, Appellant, vs. Mrs. Lorena S. Buford, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Watkins and Mr. J. N. Flowers for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. John A. Tyson for the appellees in opposition thereto.
339	

Charles Vinyard and W. A. Thompson, Appellants, vs. North Side Canal Company, Limited, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. Eldridge for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. E. A. Walters for the appellees in opposition thereto.
341	
Joseph Dianish, Thomas Ceska, et al., Appellants, vs. The Village of Broadview.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stuart E. Knappen and Mr. Meyer Abrams for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. James McKeag and Mr. William A. Morrow for the appellee in opposition thereto.
343	
Edward Eliason and Elin Eliason, Appellants, vs. Charles Wilborn, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Matthias Concannon for the appellants.
347	
Carysburg Manufacturing Company, Appellant, vs. Board of Commissioners of Pender County, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Roundtree and Mr. F. S. Spruill for the appellant.
349	
California Delta Farms, Inc., Appellant, vs. Chinese American Farms, Inc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. Eldred Boland for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Albert H. Elliot for the appellee in opposition thereto.
392	

John Hamilton Chinnis, Petitioner,
357 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel T. Ansell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. M. C. Masterson for the respondent.

George Albrecht, et al., Petitioners,
386 vs.
August Lohse, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George A. Lytle for the petitioners.

Arvid Pearson and A. J. Hennessy, Petitioners,
387 vs.
A.W. Higgins, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George D. Collins for the petitioners.

Yutaka Fukunaga, also known as Myles Yutaka Fukunaga, etc., Petitioner,
391 vs.
Territory of Hawaii.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eric Lyders for the petitioner, and by Mr. George J. Hatfield, Mr. James F. Gilliland, and Mr. Francis Brooks for the respondent.

Jack Applybe and Robert Snyder, Petitioners,
394 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold C. Faulkner for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Wm. Powlowec, next friend, etc., Petitioner,
398 vs.
Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger O'Donnell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

George F. Menggeler, Administrator, etc. Petitioner,
399 vs.
Arthur B. Allen, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Thummel for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Miller E. McGilchrist, and by Mr. Jewall Key for the respondent.

Business Men's Assurance Company of America, Petitioner,
400 vs.
Georgia A. Campbell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Egbert F. Halstead for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Feirich for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
402 vs.
Guaranty Trust Company of New York, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Elmer B. Collins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph M. Hartfield, Mr. Edwin S. S. Sunderland, Mr. James H. McIntosh, Mr. Henry V. Poor, Mr. Charles Bunn, Mr. Warren S. Carter, Mr. Mortimer H. Boutelle, and Mr. Edward H. Blanc for the respondents.

A. C. Bamsey,
Petitioner,
404 vs.
State of Iowa.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Wisdom for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Fletcher and Mr. Neill Garrett for the respondent.

Jacqueline S. Sankey, a minor, etc.,
Petitioner,
405 vs.
W. G. Skelly, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert B. Keenan, Mr. A. J. Hill, and Mr. Benj. F. Bledsoe for the petitioner, and by W. P. Z. German, Alvin F. Molony, Mark McMahon and Gillis A. Johnson for the respondents.

Paso Robles Mercantile Company,
Petitioner,
406 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip G. Sheehy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Mari Tollefsen Todok, et al.,
Petitioners,
412 vs.
Union State Bank of Harvard, Nebraska, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Edgerton and Mr. Norris Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank D. Williams for the respondent.

Panama Mail Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
425 vs.
Ernestina Isabelle Vargas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas A. Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Littlepage, It is ordered that Arthur G. Logan, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert N. Miller, It is ordered that Samuel M. Haskins, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Benton, It is ordered that E. H. Hogueland, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin S. Mack, It is ordered that Mangum Weeks, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George J. Feldman, It is ordered that Louis C. Henin, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Erwin P. Werner, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur T. George, It is ordered that Leonard S. Barnes and Frederick von Schrader, Esquires, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that William H. Carey, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Berry King, It is ordered that William Judson Holloway, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth McKellar, It is ordered that Samuel Work Garratt, Esquire, of Hot Springs, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Woodard, It is ordered that Louis B. Montfort, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, Joseph V. Quarles, Esquire, of Chenequa, State of Wisconsin, and Floyd Eugene Thompson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard N. Elliott, It is ordered that John F. Lillard, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,
Petitioner,
179 vs.
John F. Guenther.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James C. Davis, Federal Agent,
Petitioner,
188 vs.
Mrs. Mary Preston, Administratrix.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Aluminum Castings Company,
Petitioner,
198 vs.
Carl F. Routzahn, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
212 vs.
Donato Marcone, as Administrator of the Estate of Joseph Marcone, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas A. Early, Receiver of the Farmers & Merchants National Bank of Lake City,
Petitioner,
226 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

District of Columbia,
Petitioner,
229 vs.
Charles H. Fred, alias Hamilton C. Fred.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Victorio Nogueira,
Petitioner,
248 vs.
The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
250 vs.
Ox Fibre Brush Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Miller,
Petitioner,
261 vs.
H. J. McLaughlin, Secretary of the Department of Agriculture for the State of Nebraska, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Henrietta Mills,
Petitioner,
270 vs.
Rutherford County, in the State of North Carolina and W. C. Hardin, Sheriff.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Quapaw Land Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
300 vs.
S. H. Bolinger.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company,
Petitioner,
303 vs.
Mabel C. Toops, Administratrix of the Estate of M. C. Toops, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Franc-Strohmenger & Cowan, Inc.,
Petitioner,
305 vs.
Baro Forchheimer, doing business under the name and style of B. Forchheimer & Company, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Walter A. May, Herbert L. May, Edwin C. May, Executors of the Last Will and Testament of Pauline May, deceased,
Petitioners,
311 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Niles Bement Pond Company,
Petitioner,
314 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
323 vs.
Kansas City Structural Steel Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
324 vs.
Kansas City Structural Steel Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Becker Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
334 vs.
William Snyder, by his next friend Albert Snyder.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Ohio is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
340 vs.
Nelson B. Updike, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles A. Corliss,
Petitioner,
344 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, sued in the name of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation,

Petitioner,

345 vs.

P. LeRoy Harwood, as trustee in bankruptcy of Groton Iron Works and Isaac Siegel.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

356 vs.

The Pilliod Lumber Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Georgia Power Company,

Petitioner,

363 vs.

City of Decatur.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry Escher, Ancillary Administrator of Jak. Robert Sigg-Fehr, deceased, et al.,

Petitioners,

365 vs.

Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of the United States and Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Trade Commission,

Petitioner,

370 vs.

Western Meat Company, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Cincinnati,

Petitioner,

372 vs.

Margaret W. Vester.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Cincinnati,
Petitioner,
373 vs.
James S. Richards and Paschal L. Richards.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The City of Cincinnati,
Petitioner,
374 vs.
Lewellyn B. Reakirt.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Western Cartidge Company,
Petitioner,
375 vs.
Louis L. Emmerson, Secretary of State of the State of Illinois.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Inez M. Jamison, William N. Dykman, and Martin E. Goetzinger, Executrix and Executors of William A. Jamison, deceased,

Petitioners,

390 vs.

Valentin Encarnacion.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charter Shipping Company, Ltd.,

Petitioner,

397 vs.

Bowring, Jones & Tidy, Ltd.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

402 vs.

Guaranty Trust Company of New York, et al.,

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mari Tollefsen Todok and Knute C. Engen,

Petitioners,

412 vs.

Union State Bank of Harvard, Nebraska, a corporation, Leroy A. Megrue, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Panama Mail Steamship Company,

Petitioner,

425 vs.

Ernestina Isabelle Vargas.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Vesta Battery Corporation,

Petitioner,

275 vs.

The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted, and the case is advanced for argument with case No. 127, Universal Battery Company, vs. The United States. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Good Springs Anchor Company, a corporation, and Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.	Order allowing certiorari.

329

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Good Springs Anchor Company, a corporation, and Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

329

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California with directions to dismiss the suit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John L. Mimnaugh, Jr., Executor of the Will of John L. Mimnaugh, deceased, Petitioner, vs. The United States.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

163

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

G. L. Ramsey and Alice M. Ramsey,

Petitioners,

166 vs.

The City of Oxford, a Municipal Corporation, O. D. Nevitt, Mayor of the City of Oxford, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Walker M. Long, Temporary Administratrix of the Estate of H. A. Long, deceased, and W. H. McCullough,

Petitioners,

168 vs.

American Railway Express Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States,

Petitioner,

170 vs.

Frederick J. Middlebrook, as Receiver of Hudson Navigation Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Louis W. Kepner. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

171

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Valentine Gits. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

172

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alvaro Boera and Ramon J. Boera, co-partners doing business under the firm name and style of Boera Brothers, Petitioners, vs. The Steamship "Buckleigh", her engines, etc., et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

174

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Warren E. Burns, Williard A. Walsh and
Carl Schaetzer,
Petitioners,
175 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur J. Dibble,
Petitioner,
176 vs.
Unadilla Valley Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank J. Wolber,
Petitioner,
177 vs.
Ford Motor Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Cade,
Petitioner,
178 vs.
Catherine Holt, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John T. Burkett,
Petitioner,
180 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Griffith Henshaw, Executor, Estate of William G. Henshaw, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
181 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Greylock Mills,

Petitioner,

182 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tracy Waldron Fruit Company,

Petitioner,

185 vs.

Southern Pacific Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District, State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District, State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Painless Parker Dentist, a Corporation,

Petitioner,

186 vs.

The People of the State of Colorado.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Judice Co., Incorporated and Louisiana Western Railroad Company, Petitioners, vs. Village of Scott. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

187

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Nelson V. McMullen, Petitioner, vs. W. D. Lewis, Mrs. Mary Dickinson, Bedford Corporation, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

189

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

192

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Adrien Hebert,

Petitioner,

194 vs.

First National Bank of Abbeville.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Richard S. Woodliff,

Petitioner,

195 vs.

Citizens Building and Realty Co., Charles M. Ross, Mark T. Ross, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company,

Petitioner,

196 vs.

Rollin E. Talbert, Administrator of the estate of Clyde M. Lillard, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Public Service Commission of Indiana, Frank T. Singleton, John W. McCardle, et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. The Vincennes Water Supply Company. 197

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Frank Miller Company, Petitioner, vs. The Bassick Manufacturing Company. 201

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hubert Bosarge and Clarence Ladnier, Petitioners, vs. The State of Alabama. 202

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Alabama.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Monongahela West Penn Public Service Corporation, Petitioner, vs. George Albey. 203

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. James Wheeler. 204

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fort Dodge, Des Moines & Southern Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Herbert Yarn. 205

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O. B. Morrisette, Petitioner,
207 vs.
Boulevard Bridge Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Richmond Screw Anchor Co., Inc., Petitioner,
208 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Petitioner,
209 vs.
George Bush.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

City of Gainesville,
Petitioner,
210 vs.
Brown-Crummer Investment Company,
Southern Surety Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry T. Read, by J. Harrington Edwards,
Attorney in Fact,
Petitioner,
211 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the
Interior, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alice G. Kales,
Petitioner,
213 vs.
Fred L. Woodworth, individually and as
Collector of Internal Revenue, First
District of Michigan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

United States of America, on the
Petition of Marinelli Rocco on the
relation of Marinelli Constantino,
Petitioner,
214 vs.
Arthur J. Karnuth, District Director
of Immigration, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Reynolds Mortgage Company,
Petitioner,
215 vs.
Abraham Lincoln Life Insurance Company
and Marquette Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emma Owens,
Petitioner,
216 vs.
Jarman C. Waldon, as Administrator
of the Estate of Logan Owens, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals, 8th Judicial District, Cuyahoga County, State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals, 8th Judicial District, Cuyahoga County, State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Det Forende Dampskibs Selskab,
Petitioner,
217 vs.
Insurance Company of North America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Rosenberg and Isadore Rosenberg, co-partners doing business under the name of Rosenberg Iron & Metal Company,
Petitioners,
218 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John C. Lynch, as Receiver of Pacific Coast Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
219 vs.
International Banking Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

General Electric Company and Ernst Stoffregen,

Petitioners,

220 vs.

Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Royal Baking Powder Company,

Petitioner,

221 vs.

Federal Trade Commission and John F. Nugent, Charles W. Hunt, et al., Commissioners.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Johnson-Wentworth Company,

Petitioner,

224 vs.

Joseph G. McDonough.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arabella E. Bodkin, sometimes named and referred to as Mrs. Patrick H. Bodkin,

Petitioner,

225 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Illinois Coal Corporation,

Petitioner,

227 vs.

American Mine Equipment Company, a corporation, Rice Miller, as Receiver for the Illinois Coal Corporation, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Illinois Coal Corporation,

Petitioner,

228 vs.

American Mine Equipment Company, a corporation, Rice Miller, as Receiver for the Illinois Coal Corporation, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Texas Power & Light Company, Petitioner, vs. Fairbanks Morse & Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

230

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Texas Electric Service Company, Petitioner, vs. Fairbanks Morse & Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

231

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ringling Trust & Savings Bank, et al., Petitioners, vs. Whitfield Estates, Inc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

233

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

C. A. Marrs, et al., Petitioners, vs. The City of Oxford, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

234

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Britain Steamship Company, Ltd., Petitioner, vs. Munson Steamship Line. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

236

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

American Sales Corporation, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

239

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitionbe, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Harry W. Lutton. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

240

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Navigazione Libera Triestina, S. A., Petitioner, vs. Robins Drydock & Repair Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

241

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Transoceanica Societa Italiana Di Navigazione, Petitioner, vs. Patent Vulcanite Roofing Company, Inc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

242

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Norman Lee Freeman, for himself and
all others similarly situated,

Petitioner,

243 vs.

Timothy Nolan Hopkins, sometimes known as Timothy Thomas Nolan, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Lee Mahin,

Petitioner,

244 vs.

The Positype Corporation of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles P. Howard and International
Typographical Union, An Association,

Petitioners,

246 vs.

Walter J. Weissman, James F. Carr,
Munro Roberts, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John G. Lonsdale,

Petitioner,

249 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Rockwood Corporation of St. Louis,

Petitioner,

251 vs.

Bricklayer's Local Union No. 1 of St. Louis, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Hirschi,

Petitioner,

252 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New Orleans Bank & Trust Company,
Petitioner,
253 vs.
Mike S. Hart, Receiver, Pere Marquette Building Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
255 vs.
Emma Crouch, Administratrix.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles H. Johnson,
Petitioner,
256 vs.
Mary N. McCloud, a Free Dealer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frances Perry,
Petitioner,
257 vs.
Capital Traction Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lulu K. Perry,
Petitioner,
258 vs.
Capital Traction Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eda Matthiessen,
Petitioner,
259 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern Surety Company and National Surety Company,

Petitioners,

260 vs.

Commercial Casualty Insurance Company and County of Allegheny.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Osage County Motor Company,

Petitioner,

262 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emmons Coal Mining Corporation and The Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland,

Petitioners,

263 vs.

Sir R. Ropner & Company, Ltd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Ohio ex rel. George B. Moock,

Petitioner,

264 vs.

The City of Cincinnati and C. O. Sherrill, City Manager of the said City.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George B. Moock,

Petitioner,

265 vs.

City of Cincinnati, a Municipal Corporation, Organized Under the Laws of the State of Ohio, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sarah V. Thacker,

Petitioner,

266 vs.

Commonwealth of Kentucky.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Andrew T. Matthew, Administrator of
the estate of Ralph L. Clements, also known as R. L. Clements, deceased,
Petitioner,
268 vs.
Union Central Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Aktieselskabet Dampskib Gansfjord,
Claimant of the S.S."Gansfjord", et al.,
Petitioners,
271 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago Frog & Switch Company,
Petitioner,
272 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kunglig Jarnvagsstyrelsen, also Known as
the Royal Administration of the Swedish
State Railways,
Petitioner,
273 vs.
Dexter & Carpenter, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William T. Graff, Charles M. Graff,
and A. Lawson Baxter, et al.,
Petitioners,
274 vs.
Victor H. Wallace, D. Irving Coakley
and Nellie L. Coakley, Trustees.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Cady, Schapiro & Schapiro and
Schapiro & Schapiro,
Petitioners,
277 vs.
M. D. Mirsky & Co., Inc., Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Cracker Jack Co., Petitioner, vs. The United States. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

278

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Cracker Jack Co., Inc., Petitioner, vs. The United States. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

279

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Shotwell Mfg. Co., Petitioner, vs. The United States. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

280

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter A. Lorenz, et al., Petitioners, vs. James S. Mabon, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

283

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clyde A. Davis, Trustee in Bankruptcy,
of The By-Products Recovery Co., Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
284 vs.
Charles R. Mabee, May C. Mabee, Mabee Patents Corporation, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Hoosier Casualty Company,
Petitioner,
286 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Abner Francis Dodd,
Petitioner,
287 vs.
Union Indemnity Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Calvin Pardee, et al., Petitioners,
288 vs.
William H. Howcott, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pardee Company, Petitioner,
289 vs.
William H. Howcott, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Isaac L. Rosenstein, Louis Marcus, John Palmer and Morris Cleit, Petitioners,
290 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Clinton Corn Syrup Refining Company,

Petitioner,

291 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Candy Company,

Petitioner,

292 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fort Dodge, Des Moines & Southern Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

293 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

297 vs.

Fernia Koonse, Administratrix of the Estate of Melbourne M. Koonse, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

S. Naitove & Co., Inc.,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

298 vs. to the Court of Appeals of the

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of District of Columbia.

Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bickett Coal & Coke Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

299 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Abbie Conner, Nettie Conner,

William Neff, et al.,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

302 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Herman D. Cornell, Executor of the of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Estate of Robert Oglesby, deceased,

et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pratt Chuck Company,
Petitioner,
304 vs.
Crescent Insulated Wire & Cable Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

May Cook,
Petitioner,
306 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Edwin A. Krauthoff,
Petitioner,
305 vs.
The Kansas City Joint Stock Land Bank of Kansas City, Missouri, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Sara H. Ross, Executrix of John W. Ross,
deceased and individually, et al.,
Petitioners,
310 vs.
J. L. White, Trustee in Bankruptcy
of James L. Lamping, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis Clements, Trustee in Bankruptcy
of Pike County Collieries Company,
Bankrupt.,
Petitioner,
312 vs.
Fred I. Conyers, Receiver of Pike
County Collieries Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Boston and Maine Railroad,
Petitioner,
313 vs.
Arthur J. Watkins.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Hampshire.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Hampshire, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Universal Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
315 vs.
Gulf Refining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jack Murphy,
Petitioner,
316 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Pacific Improvement Company,
Petitioner,
317 vs.
The Pittsburgh, Shawmut and Northern Railroad Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ostrander-Seymour Co., Petitioner, vs. Grand Rapids Electrotype Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

318

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John L. Burke, Frank W. Burke, Mary A. Channing, et al., Petitioners, vs. The Sanitary District of Chicago, The Corn Products Refining Company, Roswell B. Mason, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

319

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles L. Apfel, Stephen B. Gibbons, Bertrand A. Unger, et al., Petitioners, vs. Andrew W. Mellon, J. W. McIntosh, Roy A. Young, et al., etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

320

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

August Aschenbach,
Petitioner,
321 vs.
Sullivan Mining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Huber Hoge, Inc.,
Petitioner,
322 vs.
Smith & Wesson, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. G. Richardson,
Petitioner,
325 vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Blackmore Investment Company, a Corporation,

Petitioner,

327 vs.

Axel A. Johnson, Ida Johnson, Title Insurance and Guaranty Company, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph W. Cline, Henry V. Wall and S. R. Deacon,

Petitioners,

328 vs.

J. S. Cosden, J. S. Cosden, Trustee for Cosden Oil & Gas Company of Tulsa, Oklahoma, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred Phillips,

Petitioner,

330 vs.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern California Utilities, Inc.,

Petitioner,

331 vs.

City of Huntington Park, a Municipal Corporation, The City Council of The City of Huntington Park, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. T. Hurley and J. T. Fleishel, Trustees of the Cain-Hurley Lumber Company,

Petitioners,

332 vs.

Illinois Power & Light Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas S. Dugan,

Petitioner,

333 vs.

M. M. Logan, J. A. Siedel, and Sallie E. Martin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William Habermel, Trustee,

Petitioner,

335 vs.

E. B. Mong, Russell Producing Company, H. R. Stump, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southern California Edison Company,

Petitioner,

337 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, City of Los Angeles, a municipal corporation, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

342 vs.

Alma Kane, as administratrix of the estate of Frank P. Kane, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Security Trust Company, South Side Bank & Trust Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. Ben S. Baer.

346 On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ohio Clover Leaf Dairy Company, Petitioner, vs. Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

348 On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Simmons Company, Petitioner, vs. Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

354 On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Royal Leikin and Moe Lieberman,
Petitioners,
355 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Emil Hansen, permanent receiver of
Syracuse Sand Company,
Petitioner,
358 vs.
E. I. DuPont De Nemours & Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific
Railway Company,
Petitioner,
359 vs.
Burr S. Stottle, Administrator of the
Estate of Steve Martin, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Behn, Meyer & Company, Limited,

Petitioner,

360 vs.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.,

Petitioners,

371 vs.

Behn, Meyer & Company, Limited.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Federal Electric Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

361 vs.

Flexlume Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Chicago Miniature Lamp Works, Herman Resler and Company and Universal Sign Company,

Petitioners,

362 vs.

Flexlume Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Symington-Anderson Company,

Petitioner,

366 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Yellow Motor Company of St. Louis,

Petitioner,

367 vs.

William Broderick and Irene Broderick, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wilton McCarthy,

Petitioner,

369 vs.

United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Uniform Printing & Supply Company,

Petitioner,

369 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company,

Petitioner,

376 vs.

A. L. Garrett, as Administrator of the estate of John G. Garrett, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Remington Rand, Inc.,

Petitioner,

377 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Remington Rand, Inc.,

Petitioner,

378 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hyman Polski, Charles Geller, Harry Skar, et al.,

Petitioners,

379 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

North River Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

380 vs.

Edmond Becnel, Alcee Becnel and Joseph Gottlieb.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Swift & Company,

Petitioner,

381 vs.

American Transportation Company, Howard E. Jones, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Armour & Company,

Petitioner,

382 vs.

American Transportation Company, Howard E. Jones, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Wilson & Company, Inc., (formerly Sulzberger & Sons Company), Petitioner,

383 vs.

American Transportation Company, Howard E. Jones, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tommie Hill and A. W. Karns, Petitioners,

384 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Madge Hill Karns, Petitioner,

385 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carl F. Bogelmann,
Petitioner,
393 vs.
Steamer "Roseway", James F. Quinn.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company,
Petitioner,
401 vs.
The Wheeling & Lake Erie Railway Company, The Cleveland Union Terminals Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John Hamilton Chinnis,
Petitioner,
357 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George Albrecht, William Albrecht
and George Barr,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

386 vs. to the Appellate Court of the

August Lohse and Nichols Shephard State of Illinois.
Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arvid Pearson and A. J. Hennessy,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

387 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

A. W. Higgins, as Trustee in Bank- of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.
ruptcy of Louis Morgan (a bankrupt).

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Yutaka Fukunaga, also Known as Myles
Yutaka Fukunaga, also Known as On petition for writ of certiorari
Myles Fukunaga, to the United States Circuit Court

Petitioner, of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

391 vs.

Territory of Hawaii.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jack Applybe and Robert Snyder,
Petitioners,
394 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America ex rel.
Wm. Powlowec, next friend of John
Powlowec,
Petitioner,
398 vs.
Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of
Immigration at the Port of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George F. Henggeler, Administrator
de bonis non of the Estate of George
Henggeler, deceased,
Petitioner,
399 vs.
Arthur B. Allen, Collector of Internal
Revenue for the District of Nebraska.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Business Men's Assurance Company of America,

Petitioner,

400 vs.

Georgia A. Campbell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

A. C. Bamsey,

Petitioner,

404 vs.

State of Iowa.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacqueline S. Sankey, a minor, by Faye Williams, her guardian and next friend,

Petitioner,

405 vs.

W. C. Skelly, F. P. Lieuallen and Skelly Oil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Paso Robles Mercantile Company,
Petitioner,
406 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bickett Coal & Coke Company,
Petitioner,
299 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this case to the Court of Claims for additional findings,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lillie A. La Plain and Victor A. Roeder,
Appellants,
415 vs.
Annie Allard.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file out of time the statement of points to be relied upon and designation of parts of record to be printed in this cause, It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
6, Original. vs.
State of Texas, defendant,
The United States of America, intervener.

The motion to postpone consideration of the Commissioner's report herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Berry King, for the complainant, The State of Oklahoma.

Ramon A. Arnaldo,
Petitioner,
326 vs.
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Jaro
and Rev. F. Sofronio Barando.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, Mr. Daniel C. Roper, Mr. Henry J. Richardson, and Mr. W. D. Jameson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Daniel C. Donoghue for the respondents.

New York Marine Company,
Petitioner,
407 vs.
Cranberry Creek Coal Company, et al.;
New York Marine Company,
Petitioner,
408 vs.
Robert Loughlin;
New York Marine Company,
Petitioner,
409 vs.
Thomas J. Howard;
New York Marine Company,
Petitioner,
410 vs.
Sinram Brothers, Inc.;
New York Marine Company,
Petitioner,
411 vs.
Red Star Towing & Transportation Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the petitioner, and by Mr. John C. Prizer and Mr. Carroll Single for the respondents.

William S. Murray, Anna Jane Murray, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
413 vs.
Monidah Trust, a corporation, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred Lucking, Mr. William Lucking, and Mr. Nat Schmulowitz for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward I. Barry for the respondents.

Thomas W. White, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
414 vs.
Hood Rubber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Parham R. Gary for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank D. Bright and Mr. H. Stanley Hinrichs for the respondent.

Mary S. Young, as Executrix, etc.,
Petitioners,
416 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dudley F. Phelps and Mr. Frank M. Swacker for the petitioners, and by Mr. Gordon M. Buck for the respondent.

Atlanta Terminal Company,
Petitioner,
418 vs.
Georgia Public Service Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mark Bolding and Mr. Arthur Heyman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel D. Hewlett for the respondent.

Bush Terminal Company,
Petitioner,
419 vs.
S. S. "Sidney M. Hauptman," her engines, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. D. Duncan and Mr. Russell T. Mount for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark W. Maclay and Mr. John Tilney Carpenter for the respondents.

Ruffin Collie, Clinton Cook, et al., Petitioners, 423 vs. Thomas D. Fergusson, F. W. Darling, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob L. Morewitz for the petitioners.
The Ann Arbor Railroad Company, The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, et al., Appellants, 7 vs. The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.	The reargument of this case was commenced by Mr. Herman Phleger for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the appellees, The United States of America, and The Interstate Commerce Commission.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1929.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Webster Ballinger, It is ordered that Edwin L. English, Esquire, of Urbana, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cole Blease, It is ordered that William Harris Thomas, Esquire, of Union, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar M. Hitchin, It is ordered that C. H. Greenwell, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, It is ordered that Ralph S. Pierce, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, Thomas MacMahon, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washington, and William A. Reynolds, Esquire, of Chehalis, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin S. Mack, It is ordered that Chester Morrill, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that Carrie M. Lambert and F. C. Lambert, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Norris, It is ordered that Mr. William Leland Irvin, of Broken Bow, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Safe Deposit & Trust Company of Baltimore, Maryland,
Appellant,
vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Russell L. Bradford, in that behalf, leave was granted to file a brief of the City Bank Farmers Trust Company of New York, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

20

Royal Baking Powder Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Federal Trade Commission, et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to stay the order denying a petition for writ of certiorari in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

221

And it is further ordered that the issuance of the said order in this cause be, and the same is hereby, stayed for two weeks.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Ann Arbor Railroad Company, et al. Appellants, 7 vs. The United States of America, et al.	The reargument of this case was concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the appellees.
Railroad Commission of the State of California and City of Los Angeles, Appellants, 60 vs. Los Angeles Railway Corporation.	This case was argued by Mr. Arthur T. George for the appellant, the Railroad Commission of California, by Mr. Frederick von Schrader, for the appellant, the City of Los Angeles, and by Mr. Woodward M. Taylor for the appellee.
J. R. Wheeler, Petitioner, 39 vs. Howard Green, Receiver, etc.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Floyd E. Thompson for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Edwin S. Mack for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1929.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude A. Swanson, It is ordered that Harry W. McCoy, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter G. Moyle, It is ordered that Benjamin R. Howell, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Waters, Jr., It is ordered that Harold T. Gateaway, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

J. R. Wheeler,

Petitioner,

39 vs.

Howard Green, Receiver of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Edwin S. Mack for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Joseph Very Quarles for the petitioner.

Tagg Bros. & Moorhead, Richard M. Laverty, Engaged in Business Under the Name and Style of Laverty Bros; et al., etc.,

Appellants,

45 vs.

The United States of America, William M. Jardine, as Secretary of Agriculture; John G. Sargent, Attorney General, et al.

The resignation and expiration of office of William M. Jardine, as Secretary of Agriculture, and John G. Sargent, as Attorney General, appellees herein, having been suggested,

Therefore, on consideration of the motion of counsel for the appellants to substitute Arthur M. Hyde, present Secretary of Agriculture, and William D. Mitchell, present Attorney General, as parties appellee in this cause,

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tagg Bros. & Moorhead, et al., etc.,

Appellants,

45 vs.

The United States of America, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Francis A. Brogan and Mr. James M. Beck for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellees.

Fred I. King,

Petitioner,

70 vs.

The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Sisson for the respondent, and was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence Wood for the petitioner.

Karl Herbring,

Appellant,

17 vs.

Claire A. Lee, as Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Thomas MacMahon for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer Thomas, It is ordered that Alexander E. Graham, Esquire, of Okmulgee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Archibald J. Treat, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Vaten, It is ordered that Clifford W. Mills, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Miller, Jr., It is ordered that Littleton M. Wickham, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, and William Pepper Constable, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

G. C. Abernathy, Administrator of the Estate of Robert Lee Alexander, deceased, et al.,
Petitioners,
285 vs.
State of Oklahoma, ex rel. A. W. Gear, A. J. Gwenby, et al.

On consideration of the motion to defer the consideration of the petition for certiorari in this cause for two additional weeks,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Karl Herbring,
Appellant,
17 vs.
Claire A. Lee, as Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Thomas MacMahon for the appellant.
The Court declined to hear further argument.

O. E. Sutter, H. H. Birkett, et al.,
Petitioners,
18 vs.
Midland Valley Railroad Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Harry William Hart for the petitioners. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Safe Deposit and Trust Company of Baltimore, Maryland,
Appellant,
20 vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia.

This case was argued by Mr. Littleton M. Wickham for the appellants, and by Mr. Henry R. Miller, Jr., for the appellee.

Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,
Petitioner,
21 vs.
Nick Mihas.

This case was argued by Mr. David H. Leake for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph D. Ryan for the respondent.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
22 vs.
Guardian Trust Company, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Samuel W. Moore for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1929.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene B. Sullivan, It is ordered that William L. Madden, Esquire, of West Haven, State of Connecticut, and Herman Levine, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, Ellsworth Bishop Foote, Esquire, of North Branford, State of Connecticut, and David M. Reilly, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard S. Doyle, It is ordered that Thomas R. Robinson, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that Thomas H. Anderson, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, and Cecil J. Dowd, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Marley, It is ordered that Henry D. Harlan, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Reed, It is ordered that Joseph Stadtfeld, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Green, Jr., It is ordered that Harry L. Robertson, Esquire, of Council Bluffs, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Blaine, It is ordered that Oscar W. Brinkman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
22 vs.
Guardian Trust Company, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Samuel W. Moore for the petitioner, by Mr. Justin D. Bowersock for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Samuel W. Moore for the petitioner.

General Insurance Company of America,
Petitioner,
23 vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Ralph S. Pierce for the petitioner and by Mr. Dennis F. Lyons for the respondent.

Mae Silver,
Appellant,
24 vs.
Benjamin Silver.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Thomas R. Robinson for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

C. A. Lindgren, Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America and
Colonna's Shipyard, Inc.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. Jacob L. Morewitz, in that behalf, leave was granted to Mr. D. A. Kelsey to appear and present oral argument pro hac vice, in this cause.

C. A. Lindgren, Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America and
Colonna's Shipyard, Inc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. D. A. Kelsey, pro hac vice by special leave of the Court for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1929.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Felix Hebert, It is ordered that James H. Kiernan, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Evans, It is ordered that John W. Hart, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, and William W. Johnson, Esquire, of Long Beach, State of California, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur M. Free, It is ordered that Joe C. Sweet, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, It is ordered that Norman Gluck, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Nugent, It is ordered that Ward Bonsall, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ira E. Robinson, It is ordered that Paul D. P. Spearman, Esquire, of Fulton, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Millan, It is ordered that Edwin C. Matthias, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Helen Dumont Carloss, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that Norman D. Keller, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Helmus, It is ordered that Robert E. Marshall, Esquire, of Sidney, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Edward Eliason and Elin Eliason,

Appellants,

347 vs.

Charles Wilborn, Carrie Wilborn and Noel State Bank.

It is now here ordered that further consideration of the motion for leave to appear as amicus curiae or to intervene as a party and to dismiss, and further consideration of the jurisdiction of this Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Geo. T. Cottingham and William C. Meginnes, doing business as City Transfer Company, et al.,

Appellants,

267 vs.

Frank G. Snook, as Chief of Division of Motor Vehicles of the State of California, et al.

On consideration of the motion to consolidate the above entitled cause with case No. 86, for hearing as one case,

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New Jersey Bell Telephone Company,

Appellant,

254 vs.

The State Board of Taxes and Assessment of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 25th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Du Pratt White, Franklin W. Hopkins, Edward J. Partridge, et al.,

Appellants,

336 vs.

Sparkill Realty Corporation and Standard Trap Rock Corporation.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 25th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James S. Harrington and Southern Surety
Company of New York,
Appellants,
vs.
James Sloan.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

90

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James S. Harrington and Southern Surety
Company of New York,
Appellants,
vs.
James Sloan.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

90

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Lessie Vada Gandy, Mrs. Lena Brown,
Mrs. Hazel McDonald, et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Louisiana Oil Refining Corporation,
Charles A. O'Neill, J. E. Reynolds, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

119

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mrs. Lessie Vada Gandy, Mrs. Lena Brown,
Mrs. Hazel McDonald, et al., Appellants, vs. Louisiana Oil Refining Corporation, Charles A. O'Neill, J. E. Reynolds, et al. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

119

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central National Bank of Lynn, Appellant, vs. City of Lynn. — Appeal from the Superior Court for Essex County, State of Massachusetts.

173

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court for Essex County, State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Central National Bank of Lynn, Appellant, vs. City of Lynn. — Appeal from the Superior Court for Essex County, State of Massachusetts.

173

Treating the appeal herein from the Superior Court for Essex County, State of Massachusetts as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tremont Lumber Company,

Appellant,

183 vs.

The Police Jury of the Parish of Winn and John Sholars, Sheriff of the Parish of Winn.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tremont Lumber Company,

Appellant,

183 vs.

The Police Jury of the Parish of Winn and John Sholars, Sheriff of the Parish of Winn.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles M. Workman,

Appellant,

199 vs.

K. E. Boone and W. S. Kingsbury, Surveyor General of the State of California and Ex-Officio Register of the State Land Office.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles M. Workman,

199 vs. Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

K. E. Boone and W. S. Kingsbury, Surveyor General of the State of California and Ex-Officio Register of the State Land Office. State of California.

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of California as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles M. Workman, Katherine Irene Workman, Jerome Workman, et al., Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

200 vs

K. E. Boone and W. S. Kingsbury, Surveyor General of the State of California and Ex-Officio Register of the State Land Office.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles M. Workman, Katherine Irene Workman, Jerome Workman, et al., Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

200 vs.

K. E. Boone and W. S. Kingsbury, Surveyor General of the State of California and Ex-Officio Register of the State Land Office.

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of California as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter Muselin,

Appellant,

294 vs.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Peter Muselin,

Appellant,

294 vs.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tom Zima,

Appellant,

295 vs.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tom Zima,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

295 vs. State of Pennsylvania.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Milan Resetar,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

296 vs. State of Pennsylvania.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Milan Resetar,

Appeallant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

296 vs. State of Pennsylvania.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Dianish, Thomas Ceska,
Joseph Vancura and Agnes Vancura, Appellants, vs. The Village of Broadview. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

343

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joseph Dianish, Thomas Ceska,
Joseph Vancura and Agnes Vancura, Appellants, vs. The Village of Broadview. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

343

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Allen & Reed, Inc., Appellant, vs. Walter A. Presbrey, Benjamin P. Moulton, Edward J. McCaffrey, etc., et al. — Appeal from the Superior Court for the Counties of Providence and Bristol of the State of Rhode Island.

206

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court for the Counties of Providence and Bristol of the State of Rhode Island, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Superior Court for the Counties of Providence and Bristol of the State of Rhode Island for such further proceedings as may be appropriate in the premises.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lavaughn Booth, formerly Lavaughn Clapp and Maxine Clapp, by her next best friend, Lavonne Booth,

Appellants,

169 vs.

William Clapp, Jr., James C. Carlin and Mary R. Carlin, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lavaughn Booth, formerly Lavaughn Clapp and Maxine Clapp, by her next best friend, Lavonne Booth,

Appellants,

169 vs.

William Clapp, Jr., James C. Carlin and Mary R. Carlin, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Lavaughn Booth, formerly Lavaughn Clapp and Maxine Clapp, by her next best friend, Lavonne Booth,

169 vs. Appellants,

William Clapp, Jr., James C. Carlin and Mary R. Carlin, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio as an application for a writ of certiorari:

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Troche,

Appellant,

247 vs.

The People of the State of California.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause is advanced and set for hearing on Monday, December 2 next.

And it is further ordered that the Clerk be, and he is hereby, directed to cause the printing of the portions of the record heretofore designated by the parties under paragraph 9 of rule 13, and to pay the costs thereof as well as the clerk's costs as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

And it is also ordered that further consideration of the jurisdiction of this Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case upon the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex Parte:

In the matter of Charles F. Hobbs, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Kansas, et al.

20 Original.

It is now here ordered that the order of October 14, 1929, granting leave to file a reply herein be, and the same is hereby, vacated.

And it is further ordered that further consideration of the motion for the appointment of a commissioner and for leave to file a reply be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing on the petition and return. The case is set for hearing on the petition and return on Monday, November 25th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Oklahoma,

Complainant,

6 Original. vs.

The State of Texas, defendant, The United States of America, Intervener.

It is ordered that consideration of the report of the commissioner in this cause of the survey along the one hundredth meridian be, and the same is hereby, postponed until February 24th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri at the relation of Missouri Insurance Company,
Appellant,
222 vs.
Frederick Gehner, as Assessor of the City of St. Louis and as President of the Board of Equalization of the City of St. Louis, et al.

It is ordered that further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the appeal.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Home Insurance Company and Franklin Fire Insurance Company,
Appellants,
232 vs.
C. J. Dick, Texas & Gulf Steamship Company and Suderman & Young, Inc.

It is ordered that further consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari and further consideration of the jurisdiction of this Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on its merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
66 vs.
Harry M. Wurzbach.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Hawkeye Stages, Incorporated,
Appellant,
69 vs.
Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of Iowa, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carley & Hamilton, Inc., Edward Malde, doing business as A. B. C. Transfer & Storage Company, et al.,
Appellants,
86 vs.
Frank C. Snook, as Chief of the Division of Motor Vehicles, State of California.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

William J. Stratton, Secretary of State of the State of Illinois,
Appellant,
98 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

National Fire Insurance Company of Hartford,
Appellant,
104 vs.
Joseph B. Thompson, Superintendent of the Insurance Department of the State of Missouri, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Piedmont and Northern Railway Company and National Association of Railroad and Untilities Commissioners,
Appellants,
164 vs.
The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission and Southern Railway Co., et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway and Western & Atlantic Railroad,
Appellants,
165 vs.
Mrs. Clyde Morgan, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Hanover Fire Insurance Company of New York,
167 vs. Appellant,
Max Specktor, Abram Larner, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

D. S. Murphey,
Appellant,
184 vs.
The Corporation Commission of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Missouri at the relation of Missouri Insurance Company,
Appellant,
222 vs.
Frederick Gehner, as Assessor, etc.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. L. Morgan,
Appellant,
235 vs.
The State of Georgia.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Texas ex rel. T. H. Isensee, et al.,
Appellants,
245 vs.
Dee Sims, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New Jersey Bell Telephone Company,
Appellant,
254 vs.
The State Board of Taxes, etc.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Geo. T. Cottingham, et al.,
Appellants,
267 vs.
Frank G. Snook, as Chief of Division of Motor Vehicles, etc.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Memphis & Charleston Railway Company, Appellant, vs. C. L. Pace, C. C. Stephens, et al.	On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown. Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
276	
The United States of America, Appellant, vs. D. D. Adams.	On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown. Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
281	
The United States of America, Appellant, vs. D. D. Adams.	On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown. Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
282	
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, et al., Appellants, vs. J. C. Maxcy, as Receiver, etc.	On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown. Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
301	
The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company, Appellant, vs. Phoenix Indemnity Co.	On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown. Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
307	
Exchange Drug Company, Appellant, vs. Henry S. Long, as Chairman, etc.	On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown. Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.
309	

J. Du Pratt White, et al.,
Appellants,
336 vs.
Sparkill Realty Corporation, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this cause, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank H. Dohany,
Appellant,
338 vs.
Frank F. Rogers, State Highway Commissioner, etc.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this cause, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Columbus & Greenville Railway Company,
Appellant,
339 vs.
Mrs. Lorena S. Buford, etc.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this cause, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Ohio, ex rel. E. H. Bryant,
Appellant,
237 vs.
Akron Metropolitan Park District, etc.,

State of Ohio, ex rel. Pauline Wadsworth,
Appellant,
238 vs.
John A. Zangerle, Auditor, etc.

It is ordered that further consideration of the jurisdiction of this Court in these cases be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the cases on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lena M. Jones,
Appellant,
115 vs.
Consolidated Wagon and Machine Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want

Charles Vinyard and W. A. Thompson,

Appellants,

341 vs.

North Side Canal Company, Limited, a corporation and C. C. Wilburn, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Vinyard and W. A. Thompson,

Appellants,

341 vs.

North Side Canal Company, Limited, a corporation and C. C. Wilburn, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the state of Idaho as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carysburg Manufacturing Company,

Appellant,

349 vs.

Board of Commissioners of Pender County, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

California Delta Farms, Inc.,

Appellant,

392 vs.

Chinese American Farms, Inc.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

The cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fred I. King,

Petitioner,

70 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O. E. Sutter, H. H. Birkett, The Derby Oil Company, et al.,

Petitioners,

18 vs.

Midland Valley Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Thomas W. White, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
414 vs.
Hood Rubber Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ruffin Collie, Clinton Cook and Robbie Rowe,
Petitioners,
423 vs.
Thomas D. Fergusson, F. W. Darling and J. S. Darling, trading as J. S. Darling & Son, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ramon A. Arnaldo,
Petitioner,
326 vs.
The Roman Catholic Bishop of Jaro and Rev. F. Sofronio Barando.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Marine Company,

Petitioner,

407 vs.

Cranberry Creek Coal Company and Red Star Towing & Transportation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Marine Company,

Petitioner,

408 vs.

Robert Loughlin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Marine Company,

Petitioner,

409 vs.

Thomas J. Howard.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Marine Company,
Petitioner,
410 vs.
Sinram Brothers, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New York Marine Company,
Petitioner,
411 vs.
Red Star Towing & Transportation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William S. Murray, Anna Jane Murray, et al., administrators of the estate of Essie Minnick, deceased,
Petitioners,
413 vs.
Monidah Trust, a Corporation, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mary S. Young, as Executrix under the
Last Will and Testament of David G.
Legget, deceased, et al., On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioners, to the United States Circuit Court
416 vs. of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
Southern Pacific Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Atlanta Terminal Company, On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioner, to the Supreme Court of the
418 vs. State of Georgia.
Georgia Public Service Commission.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Bush Terminal Company,
Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
419 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
S. S. "Sidney M. Hauptman" her engines, of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
etc., et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O R D E R.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, November 4, to Monday, November 25, next.

Jacob A. Jacobs, et al.,
Petitioners,
453 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested;

Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party respondent in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
16 Original. vs.
State of Indiana, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file (1) motion of complainant, Commonwealth of Kentucky, to strike answers; that the bill of complaint as amended be taken pro confesso, and for a decree pro confesso; and (2) second supplemental brief for complainant in this cause,

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Interstate Commerce Commission,
Petitioner,
54 vs.
United States of America, at the Relation of the City of Los Angeles.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Frank Karr, leave was granted to file a brief of A. S. Halsted, C. W. Durbrow, Frank Karr, Robert Brennan, and E. W. Camp, as amici curiae, in this case.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
402 vs.
Guaranty Trust Company of New York, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. C. Trimble for the respondents.

Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of North Dakota, et al., Appellants, vs. Great Northern Railway Company, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Morris for the appellants.
364	
The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants, vs. Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the appellants.
395	
Carl Moe, The City of Madison, and George E. Gill, Appellants, vs. Wm. J. P. Aberg, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. M. Rieser and Mr. H. L. Butler for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. John W. Reynolds, Mr. Franklin E. Bump, Mr. John B. Jamborn, and Mr. Chauncey E. Blake for the appellees in opposition thereto.
403	
The Bassick Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. Wilmeth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. R. C. Williamson for the respondent.
350	
F. J. Stewart Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. Wilmeth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. R. C. Williamson for the respondent.
351	

Gemco Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
352 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. Wilmeth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. R. C. Williamson for the respondent.

Frank H. Sweet, as trustee, etc.
Petitioner,
353 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore B. Benson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
420 vs.
Kohler Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Howard T. Jones, and Louise T. Foster for the petitioner.

Henry L. Berg, et al.,
Petitioners,
421 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Bibb Hardison for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Harvey R. Gamble for the respondent.

Louis Oneal,
Petitioner,
422 vs.
San Jose Canning Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence A. Linn for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. M. J. Armstrong for the respondent.

Ike Danovitz, serviving partner, etc.,
Petitioner,
424 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Dunkle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Howard T. Jones, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

J. C. Tingley,
Petitioner,
427 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Warren K. Snyder for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Julius Rosenwald,
Petitioner,
430 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert N. Miller, Mr. Charles Lederer, Mr. Stuart Chevalier, and Mr. Ward Loveless for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Barham R. Gary, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Allin H. Pierce for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
431 vs.
The Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. H. H. Rumble, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. Chauncey C. Parker, and Mr. F. R. Conway for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondent.

C. A. Lindgren, Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner,
25 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the United States, and was concluded by Mr. Jacob L. Morewitz for the petitioner. Leave was granted to file memorandum for the United States by to-morrow and leave was granted the petitioner to file an additional brief on or before Thursday morning next.

Interstate Commerce Commission,
Petitioner,
54 vs.
United States of America, at the Relation of City of Los Angeles.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Jess E. Stephens and Mr. Max Thelen for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that Fred E. Pettit, Jr., Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer W. Hall, It is ordered that Louis I. Shapiro, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer R. Hendricks, It is ordered that William C. Mathes, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Barger, It is ordered that Ralph A. Busick, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that William Fulton Tarver, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Interstate Commerce Commission,
Petitioner,
54 vs.
United States of America, at the relation of the City of Los Angeles.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Max Thelen for the respondent.

The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore,
Appellant,
55 vs.
Harold E. West, Chairman, et al., etc.,

Harold E. West, Chairman, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
64 vs.
The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore.

These cases were argued by Mr. Charles Markell and Mr. Charles McHenry Howard for the United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore, and by Mr. Thomas J. Tingley and Mr. Raymond S. Williams for the Public Service Commission of Maryland.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
16, Original. vs.
State of Indiana, et al.

The argument on the motion to dismiss this case was commenced by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for defendants, James Duane Duncan, et al., citizens of the State of Indiana, in support of the motion.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence Koenigsberger, It is ordered that Julius Ramet, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer R. Hendricks, It is ordered that Allen Wight, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph D. Sullivan, It is ordered that Adrien Winston Vollmer, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson J. Jewett, It is ordered that Frank Troutman, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, and Thomas L. Mead, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest F. Oakley, Jr., It is ordered that Edward G. Davidson, Esquire, and Lena Frank Oakley, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Paul Earnest, It is ordered that Harrison E. Knauss, and Frank L. Lowe, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, It is ordered that R. L. Read, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
16, Original. vs.
State of Indiana, et al.

The argument of the motion to dismiss this case was continued by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage, for the defendants James Duane Duncan, et al., citizens of the State of Indiana, in support of the motion; by Mr. Clifford E. Smith for the complainant in opposition to the motion, and concluded by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for defendants, James Duane Duncan, et al., citizens of the State of Indiana, in support of the motion.

The Farmers Loan & Trust Co., as sole surviving executor, etc.,
Appellant,
26 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

This case was argued by Mr. Cleon Headley for the appellant, and by Mr. A. C. Youngquist for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

Joseph H. Bromley,
27 vs.
Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams for Joseph H. Bromley, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector, etc.

Superior Oil Company,
Appellant,
28 vs.
The State of Mississippi, ex rel.
Rush H. Knox, Attorney General.

The resignation of Rush H. Knox, as Attorney General of the State of Mississippi, appellee herein, having been suggested;

Therefore, on consideration of the motion of counsel for the appellant and stipulation between the parties to substitute George T. Mitchell, present Attorney General of the State of Mississippi, as the party appellee in this cause, and to proceed to a final determination of the case as the Superior Oil Company, Appellant, vs. The State of Mississippi, ex rel. George T. Mitchell, Attorney General,

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Superior Oil Company, Appellant, 28 vs. State of Mississippi, ex rel. George T. Mitchell.	On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. William H. Watkins, leave was granted Mr. James W. Cassedy, Jr., to appear and present oral argument on behalf of the appellee, pro hac vice.
Superior Oil Company, Appellant, 28 vs. State of Mississippi, ex rel. George T. Mitchell.	This case was argued by Mr. Warren Lee Guice and Mr. William H. Watkins for the appellant, and by Mr. James W. Cassedy, Jr., for the appellee, pro hac vice, by special leave of Court.
Alexander Sprunt & Son, Inc., et al., Appellants, 19 vs. The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellants, and continued by Mr. J. Stanley Payne for the appellee, Interstate Commerce Commission.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Pedro Guevara, It is ordered that Doroteo Maraggag, Esquire, of Zamboanga, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Norman D. Keller, It is ordered that Thomas A. Thornton, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that Robert Merwin Duncan, Esquire, of Burns, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. C. Fulbright, It is ordered that John C. White, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Lamar, It is ordered that Robert Mellin, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Alexander Sprunt & Son, Inc., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, et al. — 19

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. J. Stanley Payne for appellees, The United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission; by Mr. Albert L. Reed for appellees, Arkansas Cotton Trade Association, et al.; and concluded by Mr. R. C. Fulbright for the appellants. Leave was granted counsel to file supplemental briefs within two weeks.

Alice Barbee Wick, Appellant, vs. Chelan Electric Company. — 29

This case was argued by Mr. Joseph D. Sullivan and Mr. Adrien W. Vollmer for the appellant, and by Mr. Edwin C. Matthias for the appellee.

The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants, vs. Erie Railroad Company, et al. — 30

This case was argued by Mr. Edward M. Reidy for the appellant, Interstate Commerce Commission, and by Mr. Marion B. Pierce for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Evans, It is ordered that Guy Richards Crump, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maurice D. Rosenberg, It is ordered that Jos. Fromberg, Esquire, of Charleston, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Hostetler, It is ordered that Donald H. Sweet, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth McKellar, It is ordered that William Hyman, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that Vincent W. Hughes and Charles A. Appel, Jr., Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, and D. Heywood Hardy, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Shelby S. Faulkner, It is ordered that Hartford Allen, Esquire, of Chevy Chase, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that Norman S. Richards, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

J. R. Wheeler,

Petitioner,

39 vs.

Howard Greene, Receiver of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Wisconsin for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Arthur E. Colgate, Administrator of the Estate of Clinton G. Colgate, Deceased,

Appellant,

74 vs.

The United States.

Appeal from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and statements as to jurisdiction which were argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

402 vs.

Guaranty Trust Company of New York, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 6th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Bassick Manufacturing Company,

Petitioner,

350 vs.

The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted, and the case is assigned for argument with cases Nos. 127 and 275 as one case.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

F. W. Stewart Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
351 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted, and the case is assigned for argument with cases Nos. 127 and 275 as one case.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Gemco Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
352 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted, and the case is assigned for argument with cases Nos. 127 and 275 as one case.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ike Danovitz, surviving partner of Peitler Bottle Company, Claimants, Petitioner,
424 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted, with the limitation, however, that counsel shall confine themselves, in the briefs and in oral argument, to the question whether the property seized is forfeitable under Sec. 25, Title II of the National Prohibition Act.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Frank H. Sweet, as Trustee, etc.,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

353 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America, On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court

420 vs. of Appeals for the First Circuit.

Kohler Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Henry L. Berg and Rose Berg, his wife,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

421 vs. to the Court of Appeals of the

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of District of Columbia.

Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis Oneal,
Petitioner,
422 vs.
San Jose Canning Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. C. Pingley,
Petitioner,
427 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Julius Rosenwald,
Petitioner,
430 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
431 vs.
The Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
16 Original. vs.
The State of Indiana, James Duane Duncan, Claude F. Johnson, et al.

On consideration of the motion of James Duane Duncan and other individual defendants to dismiss the bill of complaint herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, overruled in so far as it questions the jurisdiction of this Court to entertain the bill of complaint and proceed to a hearing and determination of the merits of the controversy and case therein presented, and that all other questions sought to be presented by such motion be reserved for further consideration at the hearing upon the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of North Dakota, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
364 vs.
Great Northern Railway Company, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants,
395 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carl Moe, The City of Madison, and George E. Gill, Appellants,
403 vs.
Wm. J. P. Aberg, George P. Hambrecht, H. A. Smythe, Jr., et al., as Trustees of "The Trust for the Members of University Co-operative Company", et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Carl Moe, The City of Madison, and George E. Gill, Appellants,
403 vs.
Wm. P. J. Aberg, George P. Hambrecht, H. A. Smythe, Jr., et al., as Trustees of "The Trust for the Members of University Co-Operative Company", et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
462 vs.
David A. Reed.

The resignation of David H. Blair, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, having been suggested;

Therefore, on consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Hughes to substitute Robert H. Lucas, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as the party petitioner in this cause;

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
99 vs.
Guy C. Earl.

The motion to pass and assign this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander T. Vogelsang on behalf of counsel for the respondent.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Kate Atwood, individually, etc., et al.,
___, Original. Petitioners.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lyman K. Clark, Jr., for the petitioners.

Thomas A. Baldwin, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error and Appellants,
417 vs.
State of Missouri.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file out of time the statement as to jurisdiction in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eino A. Hill,
Petitioner,
465 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Sullivan for the petitioner.

William H. Hallam,
Petitioner,
472 vs.
Samuel J. Grant.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Hallam, pro se.

The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Company,
Petitioner,
389 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stanton C. Peele, Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby, Mr. Paul E. Lesh, Mr. Dale D. Drain, and Mr. Jerome F. Barnard for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Galloway, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

James E. Tyler, Jr., et al.,
Petitioners,
428 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank S. Bright and Mr. H. Stanley Hiatricks for the petitioners and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Helen R. Carloss for the respondent.

David Pollock,
Petitioner,
432 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Philip Hill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Barham R. Gary for the respondent.

Levina Cooper, nee Perry,
Petitioner,
433 vs.
Spiro State Bank, Spiro, Oklahoma.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cicero F. Murray, Mr. R. A. Rittenhouse, and Mr. E. D. Means for the petitioner, and by C. B. Cochran for the respondent.

Annie Eva Jacobs, nee Carney,
Petitioner,
434 vs.
Sallie E. Ambrister, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cicero F. Murray and Mr. F. A. Rittenhouse Harry T.Klein, C.B.Cochran and J.H.Hill for the petitioner, and Mr. T. J. Flannelly, ~~and~~ Mr. W. D. Potter for the respondents.

Kate Atwood, individually and as administratrix, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
439 vs.
Rhode Island Hospital Trust Company, Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lyman R. Clark and Mr. William E. Carnochan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Robert Thorne, Mr. William R. Tillinghast, Mr. James C. Collins, and Mr. Dallas S. Townsend for the respondent.

Southwestern Oil & Gas Company,
Petitioner,
441 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Walton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Millar E. McGilchrist for the respondent.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

447 vs.

Benjamin F. Hendricks.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward R. Brumley and Mr. John M. Gibbons for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the respondent.

John W. Dickey,

Petitioner,

448 vs.

Lizzie E. Hurd, et al., executrices;

John W. Dickey,

Petitioner,

449 vs.

Lizzie E. Hurd, et al., executrices.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marcus B. May for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. H. Calloway for the respondents.

Tiffany & Company, a corporation, and Floyd Hurst,

Petitioners,

450 vs.

George Davis, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Kenneth I. McKay and Mr. Maynard Ramsey for the petitioners, and by Mr. O. K. Reaves for the respondent.

Fairmount Glass Works,

Petitioner,

451 vs.

Cub Fork Coal Company and Paragon Colliery Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry H. Hornbrook for the petitioner and by Mr. C. W. Nichols, Connor Hall and D. C. T. Davis, Jr., for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, November 25 next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Egan, It is ordered that William C. Ralston, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duane E. Minard, It is ordered that John Solan, Esquire, of Trenton, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, It is ordered that Louis E. Miller, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry A. Schweinhaut, It is ordered that John Dewey Sadler, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh Reid, It is ordered that Alton Luther Jordan, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin L. Potter, It is ordered that Walter Jones, of Ebensburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mae Silver,
Appellant,
vs.
Benjamin Silver.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut.

24

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Errors in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Joseph H. Bromley,
vs.
Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Pennsylvania.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

27

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that both questions must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Sutherland, in which Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice Butler concur.

D. Basil O'Connor,

Petitioner,

33 vs.

Charles W. Anderson, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the above entitled cause shall abide the decision of this Court in the case of Bromley vs. McCaughn, No. 37, October Term, 1929, and that the judgment or decree to be entered herein shall be in conformity with the result of the decision rendered in the case of Bromley vs. McCaughn;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Karl Herbring,

Appellant,

17 vs.

Claire A. Lee, as Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

Alice Barbee Wick,

Appellant,

vs.

Chelan Electric Company.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company,

Petitioner,

vs.

Nick Mihas.

On writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois and/or to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois and/or to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Appellate Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Appellate Court for the First District of the State of Illinois for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America and
Interstate Commerce Commission,

Appellants, Appeal from the District Court
30 vs. of the United States for the
Erie Railroad Company and Hoboken District of New Jersey.
Manufacturers' Railroad Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Geo. B. Williams, William J. Finn,
M. L. Myers, et al.,

Appellants, Appeal from the District Court
12 vs. of the United States for the
Ray L. Riley, as State Controller Northern District of California.
of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Separate opinion by Mr. Justice Van Devanter, in which Mr. Chief Justice Taft and Mr. Justice Butler concur.

Bekins Van Lines, Inc.; Chew Chick, Doing Business as Bay City Hauling Co.; Kenneth C. Clark, et al., etc., et al.,

Appellants,

vs.

Ray L. Riley, as State Controller of the State of California.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Safe Deposit and Trust Company of Baltimore, Maryland,

Appellant,

vs.

The Commonwealth of Virginia.

Appeal from the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Special Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Stone in which Mr. Justice Brandeis concurs.
Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes.

Safe Deposit and Trust Company of
Baltimore, Maryland,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Special Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Interstate Commerce Commission,
Petitioner,
vs.
United States of America, at the Relation of the City of Los Angeles.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

General Insurance Company of America,
Petitioner,
23 vs.
Northern Pacific Railway Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
99 vs.
Guy C. Earl.

On consideration of the motion to pass and assign the above entitled cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is set for hearing on Monday, March 3, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Elno A. Hill,
Petitioner,
465 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Eino A. Hill,

Petitioner,

465 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Hallam,

Petitioner,

472 vs.

Samuel J. Grant.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

William H. Hallam,

Petitioner,

472 vs.

Samuel J. Grant.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

J. Du Pratt White, et al.,
Appellants,
336 vs.
Sparkill Realty Corporation, et al.

ORDER.

It is ordered that this case heretofore assigned for today be, and it is hereby, reassigned for argument on Monday, January 6 next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Company,
Petitioner,
389 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James E. Tyler, Jr. and William G. Tyler, administrators of the estate of James E. Tyler,
Petitioners,
428 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

G. C. Abernathy, Administrator of the
Estate of Robert Lee Alexander,
deceased, et al.,
Petitioners,
285 vs.
State of Oklahoma, ex rel.
A. W. Goar, A. J. Owenby, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

David Pollock,
Petitioner,
432 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Levina Cooper, nee Perry,
Petitioner,
433 vs.
Spiro State Bank, Spiro, Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Annie Eva Jacobs, nee Carney,
Petitioner,
434 vs.
Sallie E. Ambrister, Dave Daube, Sam Daub, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kate Atwood, Individually and as Administratrix of Gertrude Galloway, Deceased, et al.,
Petitioners,
439 vs.
Rhode Island Hospital Trust Company, Administrator, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Southwestern Oil & Gas Company,
Petitioner,
441 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Co., Petitioner,

447 vs.

Benjamin F. Hendricks.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Dickey, Petitioner,

448 vs.

Lizzie E. Hurd, et al., Executrices.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

John W. Dickey, Petitioner,

449 vs.

Lizzie E. Hurd, et al., Executrices.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Tiffany & Company, a Corporation and Floyd Hurst, Petitioners, vs. George Davis and David Davis, et al.

450 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fairmount Glass Works, Petitioner, vs. Cub Fork Coal Company and Paragon Colliery Company.

451 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:

In the matter of Kate Atwood, Individually and as Administratrix, and Theodore Davis Boal, as Executor, ____, Original. Petitioners,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The State of New York and The City of New York.

The motion for the appointment of a Special Master in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph A. Devery in behalf of Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly for the defendant, the City of New York.

Ex parte:
In the matter of United States ex rel. Hugo de Watteville Jenitha, Petitioner,
___, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Curley C. Hoffpauir for the petitioner.

Hugh Wilhite, et al., etc., Petitioners,
85 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file out of time a petition for rehearing in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of Connecticut, Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The motion for leave to file a motion to dismiss defendant's answer was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest L. Averill for the complainant in support thereof, and by Mr. Bentley W. Warren for the defendant in opposition thereto.

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The motion for leave to file a motion to strike out certain parts of defendant's answer was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest L. Averill for the complainant in support thereof, and by Mr. Bentley W. Warren for the defendant in opposition thereto.

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The motion for the appointment of a Special Master herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bentley W. Warren for the defendant.

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
13, Original., vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The motion for leave to file a motion to amend answer to the bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bentley W. Warren for the defendant.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The State of New York and
The City of New York.

The motion to set this case for hearing on bill and answer was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Duane E. Minard for the complainant.

Ruffin Collie, et al.,
Petitioners,
423 vs.
Thomas D. Fergusson, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Silas B. Axtell in behalf of Mr. Jacob L. Morewitz for the petitioners.

Royal Insurance Company, Ltd., et al.,
Petitioners,
123 vs.
United States Shipping Board
Merchant Fleet Corporation.

On consideration of the motion for leave to amend the record in this cause nunc pro tunc in accordance with a stipulation of counsel,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte: In the matter of Minnie Rishel, ___, Original. Petitioner.	The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Minnie Rishel pro se.
Ex parte: In the matter of the Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al., 21, Original. Petitioners.	The return of the Judges of the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana to the Rule to Show Cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by the Honorable George M. Burquin and the Honorable Charles N. Pray.
The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner, 113 vs. R. L. Bryant, Administrator, etc.	The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Curry for the respondent in support thereof, and by Mr. J. M. Perry for the petitioner, in opposition thereto.
Felix De Leon and Vincente Sotto, Petitioners, 396 vs. Sotero Ignacio.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Felix De Leon and Mr. Vincente Sotto pro se.
Arthur Kasherman, Petitioner, 436 vs. State of Minnesota.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin M. Migler for the petitioner, and by Mr. James E. Markham for the respondent.

Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Company, Executor, etc.,

Petitioner,

437 vs.

Blakely D. McCaughn, formerly Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Gordon McCouch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Millar E. McGilchrist for the respondent.

Irving Levy,

Petitioner,

438 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard L. Merrick and Mr. Howard F. Bresee for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.,

Petitioners,

443 vs.

Galeno Chemical Company, Inc., et al.;

Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.,

Petitioners,

444 vs.

D. P. Paul and Company, Incorporated;

Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.,

Petitioners,

445 vs.

J. H. Long & Company, Incorporated.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. John Henry McEvers, and Mr. Mahlon D. Keifer for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles Dickerman Williams for the respondents in Nos. 443 and 444, and by Mr. Lewis Landes for the respondent in No. 445.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway, Petitioner,
446 vs.
Kanawha Black Band Coal Company and Glenn Coal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. W. Strickling, Mr. M. Carter Hall, and Mr. David H. Leake for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. A. Lilly for the respondent.

Richbourg Motor Company, Intervenor, Petitioner,
452 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph G. Myerson and Mr. R. R. Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Mahlon D. Keifer for the respondent.

Jacob A. Jacobs, George G. Gambrill, et al., Petitioners,
453 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David Goldsmith for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Helen R. Carloss for the respondent.

Kokusai Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha, Claimant of the S. S. "Etna Maru," Petitioner,
455 vs.
Texas Gulf Sulphur Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George C. Sprague and Mr. Geo Whitefield Betts, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry M. Longley and Mr. Ezra G. Benedict Fox for the respondent.

Harry P. Coursey and True Miller, Partners, etc., Petitioners,
456 vs.
Firestone Tire & Rubber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred A. Wright and Mr. James C. Kinsler for the petitioners, and by Mr. P. E. Boslaugh for the respondent.

Alpha Steamship Corporation, et al., Petitioners,
457 vs.
Robert Cain.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carver W. Wolfe for the petitioners, and by Mr. Melville J. France for the respondent.

The Dry Dock, East Broadway and Battery Railroad Company, Petitioner,
461 vs.
The City of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred T. Davison for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly, Mr. J. Joseph Lilly, and Mr. Elliot S. Benedict for the respondent.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
462 vs.
David A. Reed.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Maynard Teall for the respondent.

Charles Jackson,
Petitioner,
463 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Amory Lee for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General [illegible], Mr. Assistant Attorney General Parmum, and Mr. W. Clifton Stone for the respondent.

Brinkerhoff-Faris Trust & Savings Company,
Petitioner,
464 vs.
Walter O. Hill, Treasurer, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roy W. Rucker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lieutellus Cunningham for the respondent.

Massachusetts Gasoline & Oil Company,
Petitioner,
466 vs.
The Go Gas Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court in and for the County of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry M. Welch for the petitioner, and by Mr. LaRue Brown for the respondents.

Fairbanks, Morse & Company and Sheffield Car Company,
Petitioners,
467 vs.
American Valve & Meter Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred L. Chappell and Mr. Howard M. Cox for the petitioners, and by Mr. F. A. Whiteley for the respondents.

Saint Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

471 vs.

Rudolph Eldracher, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. H. West and Mr. Henry Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Patrick H. Cullen for the respondents.

James Robinson Hatmaker,

Petitioner,

476 vs.

The Dry Milk Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Robinson Hatmaker pro se, and by Mr. Fritz v. Briessen for the respondent.

Robert C. Morris, Trustee, etc., et al.,

Petitioners,

487 vs.

Antonio Melian Pavia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin L. Garvin for the petitioners, and by Mr. Samuel J. Rosensohn for the respondent.

State of Ohio ex rel. John C. Popovici, Vice Consul of Roumania,

Petitioner,

35 vs.

Abram W. Agler, et al.

It is hereby ordered that the argument of this case be passed until January 6th next, as per stipulation of counsel.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, Appellant, vs. The State Board of Taxes, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Thomas C. Haight for the appellant, and by Mr. Duane E. Minard for the appellee.
254	
Ex parte: In the matter of Charles F. Hobbs, Commissioner, etc., et al., Petitioners,	The argument of this case on petition and return to the rule to show cause was commenced by Mr. John G. Egan for the petitioners.
20, Original.	

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Karl D. Loos, It is ordered that Louis Connick, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley, It is ordered that William E. Furey and Paul V. Rogers, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Darby, It is ordered that Jerome L. Richardson, Esquire, of Riverside, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Douglass, It is ordered that John S. Wurts, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George C. Butte, It is ordered that Joseph S. Bolt, Esquire, of Amarillo, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Barbour, It is ordered that Christian M. Ozias, Esquire, of Fresno, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville D. Church, It is ordered that Cornelius D. Rhret, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Claude C. Wild, Esquire, of San Angelo, State of Texas, and Thomas E. Hayden, Jr., Esquire, of Abilene, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Egan, It is ordered that Albert Frank Williams, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary. It is ordered that Frederick Steiwer, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

J. R. Wheeler,

Petitioner,

39 vs.

Howard Green, Receiver of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank, etc.

The motion for leave to file a brief of Herman M. Langworthy, receiver of the Kansas City Joint Stock Land Bank, and Floyd L. Rogers, receiver of the Ohio Joint Stock Land Bank, as amici curiae in support of the petition for rehearing

J. R. Wheeler,

Petitioner,

39 vs.

Howard Green, Receiver of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank, etc.

The motion for leave to file a brief of Bondholders' Protective Committee as amicus curiae, in support of the petition for rehearing was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cyrus Crane in behalf of Mr. James A. Reed and Mr. Massey Holmes.

Louis J. Tyson,

Appellant,

41 vs.

Roland H. Hartley, as Governor of the State of Washington, et al.

The motion for leave to file a brief of the State of Oregon, as amicus curiae, and to participate in the oral argument of this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick Steiwer in behalf of Mr. I. H. Van Winkle and Mr. J. M. Devers.

Ex parte:

In the matter of Charles F. Hobbs, Commissioner of Insurance, etc., et al.

20, Original. Petitioners,

The argument of this case on the petition and return to the rule to show cause was concluded by Mr. Robert J. Folonie for the respondent.

Edward J. Gunning,

Petitioner,

31 vs.

Gertrude L. Cooley.

This case was argued by Mr. H. Prescott Gatley for the petitioner and by Mr. Alvin L. Newmyer for the respondent.

United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, etc., et al.,

Petitioners,

32 vs.

Benjamin Lustgarten, an infant, etc.;

John Johnson,

Petitioner,

5 vs.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner in No. 32 and respondent in No. 5.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank H. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Norman D. Keller, It is ordered that William S. Doty, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that John H. Caldwell, Esquire, of Newport, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John Johnson,
Petitioner,
vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. Silas Blake Axtell, in that behalf, leave was granted Mr. Myron Scott to appear and present oral argument for the petitioner pro hac vice, in this cause.

United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
32 vs.
Benjamin Lustgarten, an infant, etc.; John Johnson,
Petitioner,
5 vs.
United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Silas Blake Axtell for the respondent in No. 32; by Myron Scott pro hac vice by special leave of Court for the petitioner in No. 5; and concluded by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner in No. 32 and the respondent in No. 5.

Royal Insurance Company, Ltd., et al.,
Petitioners,
123 vs.
United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation.

This case was argued by Mr. John C. Crawley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Federal Sugar Refining Company,
Petitioner,
56 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

The Corn Exchange Bank,
Appellant,
36 vs.
Bird S. Coler, Commissioner of Public Welfare of the City of New York.

This case was argued by Mr. Spotswood D. Bowers for the appellant, and by Mr. J. Joseph Lilly for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert A. Green, It is ordered that R. H. Chapman, Esquire, of Lake City, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph R. Little, It is ordered that Anne Scheiber, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry St. George Tucker, It is ordered that Peyton R. Evans, Esquire, of Amherst, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moultrie Hitt, It is ordered that W. A. Slaton, Esquire, of Washington, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that W. Marvin Smith, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Feely, It is ordered that William F. Cleary, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene M. Peacham, It is ordered that Edward P. Donnelly, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Railroad Commission of the State of California and the City of Los Angeles, Appellants, vs. Los Angeles Railway Corporation. | Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

60

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Separate opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds.
Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Brandeis, in which Mr. Justice Holmes concurs.
Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Stone.

Ex parte:

In the Matter of the Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al., 21, Original. Petitioners,

On petition for writ of mandamus and on rule to show cause thereupon issued.

On consideration of the petition for writ of mandamus and amended petition for writ of mandamus herein, and of the return to the rule to show cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the rule to show cause be made absolute, and that the writ of mandamus as prayed for be, and the same is hereby, granted, with directions to the respondents to vacate the decree of dismissal entered by Judge Bourquin and to take immediate steps for assembling a court of three judges to hear and determine the application for an interlocutory injunction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders of the Court:

O-R-D-E-R.

On the application of the Clerk, pursuant to Section 221 of the Judicial Code,

It is ordered that Hugh W. Barr be, and he is hereby, appointed a Deputy Clerk of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:

In the matter of United States ex rel. Hugo de Watteville Benitha, ___, Original. Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Minnie Rishel, ___, Original. Petitioner,

On consideration of the motions for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and they are hereby, denied without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Connecticut, Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a motion to dismiss the defendant's answer and to file a motion to strike out certain parts of the defendant's answer,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted, and the motions are set for hearing on Monday, January 6th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Connecticut, Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the motion for the appointment of a special master in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that the Honorable Charles W. Bunn of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be, and he is hereby, appointed special master in this cause, with power to summons witnesses, issue subpoenas, and to take such testimony as may be introduced and such as he may deem necessary to call. The master is directed to make findings of fact and conclusions of law, and to submit the same to this Court with all convenient speed, together with his recommendations for a decree. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the special master shall be subject to consideration, revision, or approval by the Court,

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
13 Original. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the motion for leave to amend the answer of the defendant in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
17 Original. vs.
The State of New York and
The City of New York.

On consideration of the motion for the appointment of a special master in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
17 Original.
The State of New York and The City of New York.

On consideration of the motion to set this cause for hearing on bill and answer,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is assigned for hearing on Monday, January 6 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Ruffin Collie, Clinton Cook and Robbie Rowe,
Petitioners,
423 vs.
Thomas D. Fergusson, F. W. Darling and J. S. Darling, Trading as J. S. Darling & Son, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 13th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,
Petitioner,
113 vs.
R. L. Bryant, Administrator, etc.

O-R-D-E-R.

It is ordered that further consideration of the motion to dismiss this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louis J. Tyson,
Appellant,
41 vs.
Roland H. Hartley, as Governor of the State of Washington, et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file brief of the State of Oregon by its State Highway Commission, and for leave to take part in the oral argument as amicus curiae,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
443 vs.
Saleno Chemical Company, Inc., Union Course Pharmacy, Inc., et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
444 vs.
D. F. Paul and Company, Incorporated.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
445 vs.
W. H. Long & Company, Incorporated.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Richbourg Motor Company, Intervenor, Petitioner,
452 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Alpha Steamship Corporation, William H. A. Walker, and Frank Daly, etc., Petitioners,
457 vs.
Robert Cain.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

462 vs.

David A. Reed.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Jackson,

Petitioner,

463 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Felix De Leon and Vincente Sotto,

Petitioners,

396 vs.

Sotero Ignacio.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur Kasherman,

Petitioner,

436 vs.

State of Minnesota.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Company,
Executor of the Will of Therese L. Coles,
deceased.

Petitioner,

437 vs.

Blakely D. McCaughn, formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Irving Levy,

Petitioner,

438 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company,

Petitioner,

446 vs.

Kanawha Black Band Coal Company and Glenn Coal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Jacob A. Jacobs, George C. Cambrill and Henry C. Hain, Executors, etc.,

Petitioners,

453 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Kokusai Kisen Kabushiki Kaisha, Claimant of the S. S. "Etna Maru,"

Petitioners,

455 vs.

Texas Gulf Sulphur Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Harry P. Coursey and True Miller,
Partners doing business under the
name and style of Coursey & Miller,
Petitioners,
456 vs.
Firestone Tire & Rubber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Dry Dock, East Broadway and
Battery Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
461 vs.
The City of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Brinkerhoff-Faris Trust & Savings
Company,
Petitioner,
464 vs.
Walter O. Hill, Treasurer and ex-
officio Collector of Henry County,
Missouri.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Massachusetts Gasoline & Oil Company,
Petitioner,
466 vs.
The Go Gas Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court in and for the County of Worcester, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court in and for the County of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Fairbanks, Morse & Company and Sheffield Car Company,
Petitioner,
467 vs.
American Valve & Meter Company and Edward E. Johnson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Saint Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
471 vs.
Rudolph Eldracher and Anna Marie Eldracher.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

James Robinson Hatmaker,
Petitioner,
476 vs.
The Dry Milk Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert C. Morris, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Merchants & Manufacturers Exchange of New York, and Louis S. Weiss, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioners,
487 vs.
Antonio Melian Pavia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Shoe Company,
Petitioner,
42 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. Charles Nagel, in that behalf, leave was granted to file reply brief of the petitioner by Friday next.

Thomas W. White, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
414 vs.
Hood Rubber Company.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank S. Bright for the respondent.

Lillie A. La Plain and Victor A. Roeder,

Appellants,

415 vs.

Annie Allard.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles C. Heltman and Mr. Charles F. Consaul for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. W. B. Stratton for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Arthur J. Aubrey, et al.,

Appellants,

426 vs.

Mahoning Valley Sanitary District, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Luther Day, Mr. William L. Day, and Mr. W. J. Kenealy for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. Jas. E. Bennett, Mr. Oscar E. Diser, Mr. Charles M. Wilkins, Mr. Paul Z. Weise, Mr. Newton D. Baker, and Mr. Carmi Thompson for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Manuel Ortega,

Appellant,

429 vs.

Magma Copper Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Norman B. Landreau for the appellant.

The State of North Dakota, doing business as the Bank of North Dakota,

Appellant,

435 vs.

Gunder Olson, as Collector, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Morris for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Seth W. Richardson, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Morton P. Fisher for the appellee in opposition thereto.

The Ohio Oil Company,

Appellant,

440 vs.

E. A. Conway, Supervisor of Public Accounts of the State of Louisiana.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. L. Herold and Mr. R. L. Benoit for the appellant.

O'Gorman and Young, Incorporated,
Appellant,
458 vs.
Hartford Fire Insurance Company of Hartford, Connecticut;
O'Gorman and Young, Incorporated,
Appellant,
459 vs.
Phoenix Assurance Company, Ltd., of London.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt and Mr. John W. Simpson, 2d, for the appellant.

Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
469 vs.
Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. M. Garwood and Mr. J. H. Tallichet for the petitioners, and by Mr. Donald M. Richberg and Mr. John H. Crooker for the respondents.

H. P. Worley,
Petitioner,
473 vs.
W. D. Hawker.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Neal E. McNeill for the petitioner.

Odie Oland Owens,
Petitioner,
474 vs.
David King Battenfield, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. B. Dudley for the respondents.

Barker Painting Company,
Petitioner,
477 vs.
Local No. 734, Brotherhood of Painters, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Merritt Lane for the petitioner, and by Mr. Morris Hillquit for the respondents.

Joe Troche,
Appellant,
247 vs.
The People of the State of California.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Ray T. Coughlin for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Charles Blind, et al.,
Appellants and plaintiffs-in-error,
34 vs.
Phillip M. Brockman, as President of the Board of Police Commissioners, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Ernest F. Oakley, Jr., for the appellants and plaintiffs in error. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Wabash Railway Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
37 vs.
John C. Barclay, et al.;
Shirley P. Austin,
Petitioner,
38 vs.
John C. Barclay, et al.

These cases were argued by Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioners, and by Mr. Joseph S. Clark for the respondents.

Louis J. Tyson,

Appellant,

41 vs.

Roland S. Hartley, as Governor of the State of Washington, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Edward P. Donnelley for the appellees, by Mr. J. M. Devers for the State of Oregon by its State Highway Commission, as amicus curiae, by special leave of court, and was submitted by Mr. Thomas Mannix for the appellant.

Louis J. Tyson,

Appellant,

41 vs.

Roland S. Hartley, as Governor of the State of Washington, et al.

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward P. Donnelly for the appellees.

International Shoe Company,

Petitioner,

42 vs.

Federal Trade Commission.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles Nagel for the petitioner.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Markley, It is ordered that George Culbreth Thomas, Alfred T. Edel, Michael James Manley, and Albert F. Wheltle, Esquires, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Nichols, Jr., It is ordered that George E. O'Connor, Esquire, of Waterford, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis H. Stephens, It is ordered that Alexander H. Bell, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isaac Lobe Strauss, It is ordered that Irving C. Goldstein, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Holtzoff, It is ordered that Charles H. Small, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Sterling, It is ordered that William E. Chilton, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that Walter E. Beebe, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Evans, It is ordered that Stanley W. Guthrie, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin F. Korell, It is ordered that Barge E. Leonard, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tasker L. Oddie, It is ordered that Albert Duffill, Esquire, of Las Vegas, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that W. L. Matthews, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas A. Jenkins, It is ordered that Thomas D. Hopkins, Esquire, of Ironton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Louis J. Tyson,

Appellant,

41 vs.

Roland H. Hartley, as Governor of the State of Washington, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

International Shoe Company,

Petitioner,

42 vs.

Federal Trade Commission.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Charles Nagel for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the respondent.

Greenway Apartment Company,

Appellant,

40 vs.

The Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Isaac Lobe Strauss for the appellant, and by Mr. Charles F. Harley and Mr. Edward M. Bassett for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer R. Hendricks, It is ordered that William H. Eckert, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles M. Galloway, It is ordered that John Bernard Tuleen, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas C. McDonald, It is ordered that Fred R. Wright, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Blaine, It is ordered that Frank W. Hall, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, It is ordered that William A. Collins, Esquire, of Bay City, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip D. [illegible], It is ordered that Justin LeRoy Johnson, Esquire, of Stockton, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that J. Sawyer Fitch, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank H. Hardee, It is ordered that George S. Taft, Esquire, of Uxbridge, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John McDuffie, It is ordered that J. Gaillard Hamilton, B. F. McMillan, Jr., and Samuel M. Johnston, Esquires, of Mobile, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence J. McLeod, It is ordered that Cass J. Jankowski, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

O-R-D-E-R.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, December 9 next, to Monday, January 6, 1930.

Louisiana Greyhound Club, Inc., Appellant, 43 vs. Frank J. Clancy, Sheriff, etc., et al.	This case was argued by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb for the appellant, and by Mr. Eugie V. Parham for the appellees.
District of Columbia, 44 vs. Georgiana Thompson. Petitioner,	This case was argued by Mr. Alexander H. Bell, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. William E. Furey for the respondent.
The Anglo & London Paris National Bank of San Francisco, Petitioner, 46 vs. Consolidated National Bank of Tucson.	This case was argued by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent.
Henry Ford & Son, Inc., Petitioner, 47 vs. Little Falls Fibre Company, et al.	The argument of this case was commended by Mr. Charles E. Nichols, Jr., for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.
Carl H. Kothe, Petitioner, 48 vs. The R. C. Taylor Trust.	This case was argued by Mr. Frank H. Purdee for the petitioner, and by Mr. George F. Taft for the respondent.
Luckenbach Steamship Company, Petitioner, 49 vs. The United States.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George A. King for the petitioner.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that Joseph L. Smith, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer Thomas, It is ordered that Stephen A. George, Esquire, of Ardmore, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Kearns, It is ordered that John J. Chester, Jr., Paul C. Hicks, Myron B. Gessaman, and Ray E. Hughes, Esquires, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Christopherson, It is ordered that Ira G. Hersey, Esquire, of Houlton, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry J. Gerrity, It is ordered that Thomas C. Marlar, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence J. McLeod, It is ordered that Fritz Mailer, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Luckenbach Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
49 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. George A. King for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Sisson for the respondent.

T. L. Carpenter and Lillie V. Carpenter,
Petitioners,
50 vs.
A. S. J. Shaw, as State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma.

This case was argued by Mr. Stephen A. George for the petitioners, and the case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Berry King and Mr. V. P. Crowe for the respondent.

Gulf, Mobile & Northern Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
51 vs.
Ruby Highnote Williams, as Administratrix, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. J. C. Hamilton for the petitioner, and by Mr. B. F. McMillan, Jr., and Mr. S. M. Johnston for the respondent.

Gulf, Mobile & Northern Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

51 vs.

Ruby Highnote Williams, as Administratrix of the Estate of Walter Williams, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

52 vs.

W. J. Howard.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, and the case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Howard for the respondent.

The United States of America,

57 vs.

Kitty Jackson, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the United States. There was no appearance for Jackson, et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. D. Jamieson, It is ordered that Andrew W. Huntress, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee Forrest Denton, It is ordered that William H. Burland, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, and Martin E. Cormley, Esquire, of Naugatuck, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maxwell A. O'Brien, It is ordered that Earl F. Wisdom, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. D. Jamieson, It is ordered that Herbert S. Ward, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry B. Mazari, It is ordered that Thomas J. Griffing, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that William B. Hornblower, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Larsen, It is ordered that Harry Griffith Weaver, Esquire, of Wheaton, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

First Addition to the Rattle Snake Drainage District, et al.,
Appellants,
58 vs.
Walter Bodeman, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Frank W. Hall for the appellees, and the case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. L. Butler, Mr. R. M. Reiser, Mr. Frank Lucas, and Mr. C. E. Buell for the appellants.

Mabel C. Reinecke, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.
Petitioner,
59 vs.
Eudore Hull Spalding.

This case was argued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Zane for the respondent.

E. Franklin Brewster,
Petitioner,
61 vs.
Bert B. Cage, Collector of Internal Revenue,

This case was argued by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. J. Sawyer Fitch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the respondent.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior,

Petitioner,

63 vs.

The United States on the relation of Emil L. Krushnic.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George C. Butte for the petitioner.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1929

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met today at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable William H. Taft, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
George Sutherland,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Grant E. Hilderman, It is ordered that Charles Henry Quimby, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward T. Fenwick, It is ordered that Charles Henry Quimby, III, and Charles Emory Phillips, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Shelton, It is ordered that Herman C. Stickney, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James H. Brown, It is ordered that Mortimer W. Spaulding, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson A. Mason, It is ordered that Ralph Woods, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ex Parte:

In the matter of Charles F. Hobbs, Commissioner of Insurance of the State of Kansas, et al. Petitioners. 20, Original.

On petition for writ of mandamus and on rule to show cause thereupon issued.

On consideration of the petition for writ of mandamus herein, the return to the rule to show cause, and argument of counsel thereupon had;

It is now here ordered by this Court that the rule to show cause be discharged and that the petition for writ of mandamus be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Thomas W. White, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 414 vs. Hood Rubber Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby granted, and the cause assigned for argument with No. 118 as one case on Monday, January 13 next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Troche,

Appellant,

vs.

The People of the State of California.

247

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Joe Troche,

Appellant,

vs.

The People of the State of California.

247

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of California as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Charles Blind, William F. Peikert,
Otto Burger, et al.,

Appellants and Plaintiffs in Error,

vs.

Phillip H. Brockman, as President of the Board of Police Commissioners of the City of St. Louis and State of Missouri;
Martin O'Brien, etc., et al., etc.

34

Appeal from and in Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Greenway Apartment Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Maryland, Most Reverend John Gardner Murray, D. D.; Reverend Arthur B. Kinsolving, D. D., et al.

Appeal from the Baltimore City Court of the State of Maryland.

40

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Baltimore City Court of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Greenway Apartment Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Maryland, Most Reverend John Gardner Murray, D. D.; Reverend Arthur B. Kinsolving, D. D., et al.

Appeal from the Baltimore City Court of the State of Maryland.

40

Treating the appeal herein from the Baltimore City Court of the State of Maryland as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Louisiana Greyhound Club, Inc.,

Appellant,

43 vs.

Frank J. Clancy, Sheriff of the Parish of Jefferson, State of Louisiana; John E. Fleury, District Attorney, and Archibald T. Higgins, Assistant District Attorney, for the Parish of Jefferson, State of Louisiana.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Anglo and London Paris National Bank of San Francisco,

Petitioner,

46 vs.

Consolidated National Bank of Tucson.

On writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Arizona in and for the County of Pima and/or to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Superior Court of the State of Arizona in and for the County of Pima and/or to the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Robert H. Lucas, as
Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. W. J. Howard. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

52

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First Addition to the Rattle Snake Drainage District, Walter Holzheuter, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Walter Bodeman, et al. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

58

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

First Addition to the Rattle Snake
Drainage District, Walter Holzheuter,
etc., et al.,
Appellants,
vs.
Walter Bodeman, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

58

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lillie A. LaPlain and Victor A. Roeder,
Appellants,
vs.
Annie Allard.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

415

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Lillie A. LaPlain and Victor A. Roeder,
Appellants,
vs.
Annie Allard.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

415

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Manuel Ortega,
Appellant,
vs.
Magma Copper Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

429

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of North Dakota, Doing Business as the Bank of North Dakota,
Appellant,
vs.
Gunder Olson, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of North Dakota.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

435

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Arthur J. Aubrey and John A. Callan,
Appellants,
vs.
Mahoning Valley Sanitary District, et al.

It is now here ordered that further consideration of the question of jurisdiction in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the cause on its merits.

426

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The Ohio Oil Company,
Appellant,
448 vs.
W. A. Conway, Supervisor, etc.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O'Gorman and Young, Incorporated,
Appeallant,
458 vs.
Hartford Fire Insurance Company
of Hartford, Connecticut.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

O'Gorman and Young, Incorporated,
Appellant,
459 vs.
Phoenix Assurance Co., Ltd.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company, H. M. Lull, G. S. Waid, et al.
Petitioners,
469 vs.
Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Barker Painting Company,
Petitioner,
477 vs.
Local No. 734, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

H. F. Worley,
Petitioner,
473 vs.
W. D. Hawker.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Odie Oland Owens,
Petitioner,
474 vs.
David King Battenfield, Charlotte Hatcher, Nettie F. McKeage, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

George F. Henggeler, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
399 vs.
Arthur B. Allen, Collector, etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file out of time a petition for rehearing in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The State of New York and The City of New York.

The motion for leave to file an intervening petition of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and memorandums thereon were submitted by Mr. Paul Shipman Andrews in behalf of Mr. Hamilton Ward for the defendant, State of New York, and by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly and Mr. J. Joseph Lilly for the defendant, the City of New York.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,
19, Original. vs.
The State of Delaware.

The motion for the appointment of a special master herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Duane E. Minard for the complainant.

Junius C. Klein, Appellant,
442 vs.
Board of Tax Supervisors of Jefferson County, Kentucky.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmund F. Trabue for the appellant.

New Orleans Public Service Incorporated, Appellant,
460 vs.
City of New Orleans.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Rosen for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Bertrand I. Cahn for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Southern Surety Company,
Petitioner,
478 vs.
Ben C. Sheldon and Hervey M. Porter.

The suggestion by the respondent of a diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ewell D. Moore for the respondent.

Robert C. Meadows,
Petitioner,
269 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jean J. Breitenstein for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. James O'C. Roberts, and Mr. James T. Brady for the respondent.

Southern Surety Company,
Petitioner,
478 vs.
Ben C. Sheldon, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. C. Mathes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ewell D. Moore for the respondents.

Ellen Mary Dunagan, as Administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
479 vs.
Appalachian Power Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Werth for the petitioner.

Stephen Ivanovitch Kolpachnikoff,
Petitioner,
480 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis B. Bracken for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Company, et al., Petitioners, 481 vs. The Philadelphia-Girard National Bank.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert T. McCracken for the petitioners.
Robert B. Johnston, Petitioner, 482 vs. Carl M. Wolter, Trustee, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. Leo Rushlander for the petitioner, and by Carl M. Wolter, pro se.
William Edelstein, Petitioner, 489 vs. Frank Gillmore, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan Burkan for the petitioner, and by Emily Holt for the respondents.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner, 63 vs. United States on relation of Emil L. Krushnic.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. George C. Butte for the petitioner, by Mr. Langdon H. Larwill for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Chester I. Long for the respondent.

The Iowa Motor Vehicle Association, et al.,

Appellants,

65 vs.

Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of Iowa, et al.;

Hawkeye Stages, Incorporated,

Appellant,

69 vs.

Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of Iowa, et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Casper Schenk for the appellant in No. 65. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Gilmer Mosser, Jr., It is ordered that Jesse E. Maid, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Pollak, It is ordered that Carl S. Stern, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul M. Segal, It is ordered that Samuel M. Goldberg, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moultrie Hitt, It is ordered that William M. Cannon, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that Emanuel Harris, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, It is ordered that Malcolm Y. Yost, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that David M. Richman, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that John A. Rence, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. B. McClintock, It is ordered that Harry Nusbaum, Esquire, of Canton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles C. Kearns, It is ordered that Albion Z. Blair, Esquire, of Portsmouth, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Bunn, It is ordered that Thomas O'C. FitzGibbon, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York; Frederick G. Ingersoll, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, and Henry Clay Carlson, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. L. Hamby, It is ordered that Claude M. Dudley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. A. Youngquist, It is ordered that Thomas P. Welch, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of Minnesota, and Morton M. Rothschild, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, It is ordered that Harold C. Haskell, Esquire, of Brookline, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Sisson, It is ordered that Sigmund W. Fischer, Jr., Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

T. L. Carpenter and Lillie V. Carpenter,

Petitioners,

vs.

A. J. J. Shaw, as State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

50

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Henry Ford & Son, Inc.,

Petitioner,

47 vs.

Little Falls Fibre Company, Asbestos Spinning and Weaving Corporation, and Harry A. Furman, et al., etc.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Hugh W. Grant, Receiver of the Struthers Furnace Company,

Petitioner,

9 vs.

A. B. Leach & Company, Inc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with instructions to determine the merits of the Receiver's claim, and for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

John Johnson,

Petitioner,

vs.

United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York with directions to dismiss the cause for lack of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, Sued in the Name of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, and Consolidated Navigation Company, Inc.,

Petitioners,

vs.

Benjamin Rustgarten, an Infant, by His Guardian Ad Litem, John A. Lydecker.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York with directions to dismiss the cause for lack of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Federal Sugar Refining Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

56

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York with directions to dismiss the cause for lack of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Royal Insurance Company, Ltd., et al., Petitioners, vs. United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

123

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

E. Franklin Brewster,

Petitioner,

61 vs.

Bert P. Cage, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

New Jersey Bell Telephone Company,

Appellant,

254 vs.

The State Board of Taxes and Assessment of the State of New Jersey.

Appeal from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes concurred in by Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore,

Appellant,

55 vs.

Harold E. West, Chairman, and J. Frank Harper and Steuart Purcell, Members, Constituting the Public Service Commission of Maryland.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice Holmes, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Harold E. West, Chairman, and J. Frank Harper and Steuart Purcell, Members, Constituting the Public Service Commission of Maryland.

Appellants,

64 vs.

The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore.

Cross-Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this cross-appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Harold E. West, Chairman, and J. Frank Harper and Steuart Purcell, Members, Constituting the Public Service Commission of Maryland,

Petitioners,

64 vs.

The United Railways and Electric Company of Baltimore.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

International Shoe Company,

Petitioner,

42 vs.

Federal Trade Commission.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Stone, concurred in by Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior,

Petitioner,

vs.

United States on Relation of Emil L. Krushnic.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

63

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and as so modified, ~~and~~ affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Farmers Loan and Trust Company, as Sole Surviving Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Henry R. Taylor, Deceased,

Appellant,

vs.

The State of Minnesota.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

26

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Concurring: Mr. Justice Stone,

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Corn Exchange Bank,

Appellant,

36 vs.

Bird S. Coler, Commissioner of Public Welfare of the City of New York.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the Judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Carl H. Kothe, Trustee,

Petitioner,

48 vs.

R. C. Taylor Trust.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and the decree of the District Court affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mabel G. Reinecke, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Illinois, Petitioner, vs. Eudora Hull Spalding. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

59

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Butler took no part in the consideration or decision of this cause.

Wabash Railway Company, Myron J. Hall, H. W. Cohu, et al., Petitioners, vs. John C. Barclay and Willoughby Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

37

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Shirley P. Austin,

Petitioner,

vs.

John C. Barclay and Willoughby Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Luckenbach Steamship Company,

Petitioner,

vs.

The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcrip of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

The United States of America,

57 vs.

Kitty Jackson, Hilda J. Foster, and Hilda J. Foster, as Administratrix of the Estate of Jack Jackson, etc.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that both questions certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. Justice Holmes announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,

17 Original. vs.

The State of New York and The City of New York.

On consideration of the motion of the State of Pennsylvania for leave to intervene in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, upon the condition that the State of Pennsylvania shall file a statement of her interests in this cause and of the relief, if any, which she seeks.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
19 Original. vs.
The State of Delaware.

On consideration of the motion for the appointment of a special master in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that the Honorable William L. Rawls, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, appointed special master in this cause, with power to summon witnesses, issue subpoenas, and to take such testimony as may be introduced and such as he may deem necessary to call. The master is directed to make findings of fact and conclusions of law, and to submit the same to this court with all convenient speed, together with his recommendations for a decree. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the special master shall be subject to consideration, revision, or approval by the Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
13 Original. vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

It is ordered that this case heretofore assigned for to-day be, and it is hereby, reassigned for Monday, January 20th, next.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
17 Original. vs.
The State of New York and the City of New York.

It is ordered that this case heretofore assigned for to-day be, and it is hereby, reassigned for Monday, January 20th, next.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Iowa Motor Vehicle Association,
Carl Heights, White Star Bus, et al.,
Appellants,
65 vs.
Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of Iowa, S. M. Richardson, Fred P. Woodruff, Charles Webster, Members of Said Board of Railroad Commissioners.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Hawkeye Stages, Incorporated,
Appellant,
69 vs.
Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of Iowa, S. M. Richardson, Fred P. Woodruff, Charles Webster, Members of Said Board of Railroad Commissioners.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Junius C. Klein,

Appellant,

442 vs.

Board of Tax Supervisors of Jefferson County, Kentucky.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

New Orleans Public Service, Incorporated,

Appellant,

460 vs.

City of New Orleans.

It is ordered that further consideration of the question of jurisdiction in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on its merits.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Brinkerhoff-Faris Trust & Savings Company,

Petitioner,

464 vs.

Walter O. Hill, Treasurer and ex-officio Collector of Henry County, Missouri.

On further consideration, it is now here ordered by this Court that the order of December 2, 1929, denying the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, be, and the same is hereby, revoked, and the petition is now granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of Wisconsin, et al., Complainants,

7, Original. vs.

The State of Illinois, et al.,

The State of Michigan, et al., Complainants,

11, Original. vs.

The State of Illinois, et al.

The State of New York, et al., Complainants,

12, Original. vs.

The State of Illinois, et al.

On consideration of the Report of the Special Master herein on the re-reference of these causes, filed in this Court on December 17th last,

It is now here ordered that any party to any of these causes may file in this Court such exceptions or objections to this Report of the Special Master as such party may be advised;

Provided, however, that such exceptions or objections be filed on or before Monday, February 3rd next.

It is further ordered that, should any exceptions or objections be filed as provided in this order, the Clerk shall set these causes down for oral hearing on such exceptions or objections at the head of the calendar on Monday, February 24th, next.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Robert G. Meadows, Petitioner,

269 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Ellen Mary Dunagan, as Administratrix
of the estate of Emery Dunagan,
deceased,
Petitioner,
479 vs.
Appalachian Power Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Stephen Ivanovitch Kolpachnikoff,
Petitioner,
480 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Company,
Henry G. Coxe, Jr., and Harry Nathans,
Trustees, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
481 vs.
The Philadelphia-Girard National Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Robert B. Johnston,

Petitioner,

482 vs.

Carl M. Wolter, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Diamond Drilling & Exploration Co., Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

William Edelstein,

Petitioner,

483 vs.

Frank Gillmore, Grant Mitchell and Paul Dulzell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Southern Surety Company,

Petitioner,

478 vs.

Ben C. Sheldon and Hervey M. Porter.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied; and on consideration of the suggestion of a diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein, it is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, also denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Ex parte:
In the matter of the Federal Radio Commission, Petitioner.
——, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to withdraw the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus and/or prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Federal Radio Commission,
Petitioner,
122 vs.
General Electric Company, et al.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. Claude R. Branch, in that behalf, leave was granted Mr. B. M. Webster to appear and present oral argument pro hac vice for the petitioner in this cause.

Ex parte:
In the matter of Ralph B. Bradford,
——, Original. Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto Gresham for the petitioner.

L. M. Willcuts, as Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
335 vs.
Charles W. Bunn.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Gerald J. Callahan, leave was granted to file a brief of the State of Massachusetts as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
356 vs.
The Pilliod Lumber Company.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry M. Ward for the petitioner in support of the motion, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the respondent in opposition thereto.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky, Complainant, vs. The State of Indiana, et al. 16, Original.	The agreed statement of facts and motion to set this case for further hearing upon the pleadings and agreed statement facts was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Reu Williams in behalf of counsel.
Ex parte: In the matter of the Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al. Petitioners, 21, Original.	The motion for the issuance of a formal writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dennis F. Lyons for the petitioners.
Walter A. May, et al., Petitioners, vs. D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc. 311	On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Arthur W. Machen, Jr., leave was granted to file brief of Safe Deposit & Trust Company of Baltimore, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
Ohio Oil Company, Appellant, vs. E. A. Conway, Supervisor, etc. 440	The joint motion to advance this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell in behalf of counsel.
Ex parte: In the matter of State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Petitioner, —, Original.	The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sigmund A. Fischer, Jr., for the petitioner in support of the motion and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the respondent in opposition thereto.

The Becker Steamship Company,

Petitioner,

334 vs.

William Snyder, by his next friend, Albert Snyder.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Cuyahoga County, State of Ohio.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the writ of certiorari in this cause be dismissed, each party to pay its own costs;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, each party to pay its own costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Charles W. Hunter,

Petitioner,

545 vs.

Bausch-Ross Tool Company, et al.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Hunter, pro se.

Thomas A. Baldwin, et al.,

Plaintiffs-in-error and Appellants,

417 vs.

State of Missouri.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Garner for the plaintiffs in error and appellants.

Tower Hill Connellsville Coke Company of West Virginia,

Petitioner,

483 vs.

Piedmont Coal Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. W. Knight for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin W. Smith, Mr. Arthur S. Dayton, Mr. E. C. Higbee, and Mr. William M. Robinson for the respondents.

The United States of America ex rel. Stephen Komlos, Petitioner, 488 vs. Joseph W. Trudell, United States Immigration inspector.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold Van Riper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

A. H. Waite, et al., Petitioners, 496 vs. The United States of America; A. H. Waite, et al., Petitioners, 497 vs. Noah Crooks, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.; Mary Z. Hibbard, Administratrix, et al., Petitioners, 498 vs. Noah Crooks, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen McReynolds for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. [illegible], Mr. Sewall Key, ~~Mr. M. E. Rothschild,~~ and Mr. W. Marvin Smith, Mr. C. M. Charest, ~~and Mr. Ottomar Hamele~~ for the respondents.

Moffer Oil Corporation, Petitioner, 502 vs. T. L. Carpenter.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leonard M. Levy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Stephen A. George for the respondent.

Illinois Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
504 vs.
City of Mayfield, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edmund F. Trabue, Mr. John C. Doolan, Mr. Robert V. Fletcher, and Mr. Charles H. Burch for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. V. Gregory for the respondents.

O. W. Powell,
Petitioner,
505 vs.
The State of Washington.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. James W. Bryan for the respondent.

Highland Milk Condensing Company,
Petitioner,
506 vs.
David W. Phillips, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh Satterlee for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Clemente Liscio,
Petitioner,
507 vs.
Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Dickerman Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John Henry McEvers, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Oriole Phonograph Company, et al., Petitioners,
508 vs.
Kansas City Fabric Products Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George H. English and Mr. Thomas Hackney for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. B. Maynard for the respondents.

Charles G. Martin, Petitioner,
512 vs.
A. M. Martin, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Raymond Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harold A. Ritz for the respondents.

Gulf Smokeless Coal Company, et al., Petitioners,
529 vs.
Sutton, Steele & Steele, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter L. Fidler and Mr. Francis W. Parker, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. D. J. F. Strother for the respondents.

E. A. Wildermuth, Petitioner,
532 vs.
Hazeltine Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Neave and Mr. Cornelius D. Ehret for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Davis and Mr. R. Morton Adams for the respondent.

Max Gutierrez, et al.,
Petitioners,
544 vs.
The Middle Rio Grande Conservancy
District, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Sutherland and Mr. E. R. Wright for the petitioners, and by Mr. Pearce C. Rodey for the respondents.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
432 vs.
Guaranty Trust Company of New York,
et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible], It is ordered that Frederick M. Bradley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, and Michol M. Sandoe, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. [illegible], It is ordered that Chas. A. Wolfe, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Conlen, It is ordered that J. Harry LaBrum, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence C. Dill, It is ordered that Ray C. Roberts, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Harry S. Wonnell, Esquire, of Hamilton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur A. Ballantine, It is ordered that Walter Welch, Esquire, of Syracuse, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse P. Frawley, It is ordered that M. Hennedy McCook, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Joseph Anderson, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
432 vs.
Guaranty Trust Company of New York, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the petitioner, by Mr. Charles Bunn for the respondents, mortgage trustees, by Mr. Henry C. Carlson for the respondents, executors of the estate of H. H. Sheriff, priority creditor, and concluded by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the petitioner.

J. DuPratt White, et al.,
Appellants,
336 vs.
Sparkill Realty Corporation, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Walter H. Pollak for the appellants, and by Mr. Jackson A. Dykman for the appellees.

The State of Ohio, on the relation of John C. Popovici,

Petitioner,

35 vs.

Abram W. Agler, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Atlee Pomerene for the petitioner.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank M. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney S. Alderman, It is ordered that Willis Smith, Esquire, of Raleigh, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Carter, It is ordered that Joe Crail, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles O'Connor, It is ordered that Grover C. Spillers, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that Sam C. Polk, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, and Joseph H. T. Bibb, Esquire, of Marshall, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

Mr. Justice Holmes announced the following order of the Court:

Ex parte:
In the matter of the State of Rhode Island and the Providence Plantations.
——, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of Ohio, on the relation of John C. Popovici,
Petitioner,
35 vs.
Abram W. Agler, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Atlee Pomerene for the petitioner, by Mr. Harry Nusbaum for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Malcolm Y. Yost for the petitioner.

John Bailey Iron Works, et al.,
Appellants,
62 vs.
Abraham Span.

This case was argued by Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the appellants, and by Mr. William J. Conley for the appellees.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
67 vs.
American Code Company, Inc.

This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clark H. Nebner for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow [illegible]

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank J. Hogan, It is ordered that John William Guider, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Russell H. Robbins, It is ordered that Henry M. Dowling, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Shelton Lisenby, Esquire, of Dothan, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert S. Regar, It is ordered that Elmer B. Woods, Esquire, of Glassboro, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Carley & Hamilton, Inc., et al.,
Appellants,
86 vs.
Frank G. Snook, as Chief of the Division of Motor Vehicles, etc.;
Geo. T. Cottingham & William C. Meginnes, Doing Business as City Transfer Co., et al.,
Appellants,
267 vs.
Frank G. Snook, as Chief of Division of Motor Vehicles, etc.

These cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. R. Crawford and Mr. Edwin C. Ewing for the appellants, and by Mr. U. S. Webb and Mr. William F. Cleary for the appellees in No. 86; by Mr. W. R. Crawford and Mr. Henry G. Hotchkiss for the appellants in No. 267. No brief was filed for the appellees in No. 267.

Jesse W. Clarke, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
68 vs.
The Haberle Crystal Springs Brewing Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur A. Ballantine for the respondent.

Minerals Separation North American Corporation,
Petitioner,
71 vs.
Magma Copper Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Henry D. Williams and Mr. William Houston Kenyon for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Davis for the respondent.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. Mc Reynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone. Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John de R. Storey, It is ordered that William Harvey Smith, Jr., Esquire, of Larchmont, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold M. Marsh, It is ordered that William Henry Harrison, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur R. Robinson, It is ordered that Chester A. Davis, Esquire, of Bedford, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Luckenbach Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
49 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to issue the mandate in this cause forthwith, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Antonia Ambrose, as Administratrix, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. William H. Carey for the petitioner and by Mr. A. O. Stanley for the respondent.
73	
Illinois Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. C. I. Crail, doing business as P. McCoy Fuel Company.	This case was argued by Mr. Edward C. Craig for the petitioner and by Mr. Stanley B. Houck for the respondent.
75	
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America ex rel. Mary I. Kadrie, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the petitioner and continued by Mr. Webster Ballenger for the respondents.
77	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, January 13th, next.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jacob L. Morewitz, It is ordered that Percy Carmel, Esquire, of Phoebus, State of Virginia, and Harry H. Kanter, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Peacock, It is ordered that A. B. Freyer, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. T. Scott, It is ordered that A. Joseph A. Rossi, and Max V. Schoonmaker, Esquires, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George C. Shinn, It s ordered that George F. Losche, Esquire, of Bogota, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cassius C. Dowell, It is ordered that Raymond B. Alberson and Charles S. Bradshaw, Esquires, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as ~~an~~ Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton K. Wheeler, It is ordered that E. F. Bunker, Esquire, of Bozeman, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. Justice Holmes announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex Parte:
In the Matter of Ralph B. Bradford,
—, Original. Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky, Complainant,
16, Original. vs.
The State of Indiana, et al.

On consideration of the motion to set the above entitled cause for hearing,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause is assigned for hearing on the pleadings and agreed statement of facts on Monday, March 3, next.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Ex Parte:
In the Matter of the Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al., Petitioners.
21, Original.

On consideration of the motion for the issuance of a formal writ of mandamus herein and of the supplement to such motion,

It is now here ordered by this Court that a formal and peremptory writ of mandamus issue in this cause, conformable to the rule to show cause which was made absolute by this Court's opinion of December 2, 1929, and that there be included in such formal writ a direction requiring the defendant, Bourquin, to vacate so much of his order of December 14, 1929, as assumes to appoint a Special Master to take testimony and assumes to fix a time for the final hearing of the cause before the statutory court of three judges.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
356 vs.
The Pilliod Lumber Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 13, 1930, immediately following the argument in Nos. 118 and 414.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Ohio Oil Company,
Appellant,
440 vs.
E. A. Conway, Supervisor of Public Accounts of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the joint motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 3, next after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Charles W. Hunter,

Petitioner,

545 vs.

Baash-Ross Tool Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Charles W. Hunter,

Petitioner,

545 vs.

Baash-Ross Tool Company and The Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Thomas A. Baldwin, Thomas A. Baldwin, Executor of the Will of Carrie Pool Baldwin, et al., etc.,

Plaintiffs in Error and Appellants,

417 vs.

State of Missouri.

On consideration of the statement as to the jurisdiction of this Court, filed herein on November 4, 1929,

It is ordered by this Court that the plaintiffs in error and appellants show cause, by printed brief to be filed with the Clerk of this Court within three weeks of this date, why the writ of error and the appeal herein should not be dismissed for the want of a final judgment.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Tower Hill Connellsville Coke
Company of West Virginia,

Petitioner,

483 vs.

Piedmont Coal Company, George S. Harah, Edgar S. Hackney, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America, ex rel.
Stephen Komlos,

Petitioner,

488 vs.

Joseph W. Trudell, United States Immigration Inspector.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

A. H. Waite, et al.,

Petitioners,

496 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

A. H. Waite, et al.,

Petitioners,

497 vs.

Noah Crooks, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Western District of Missouri.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mary Z. Hibbard, Administratrix, et al.,

Petitioners,

498 vs.

Noah Crooks, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Western District of Missouri.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Hoffer Oil Corporation,

Petitioner,

502 vs.

T. L. Carpenter.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Illinois Central Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

504 vs.

City of Mayfield, W. T. Vaughan, Mayor of Mayfield, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

O. W. Powell,

Petitioner,

505 vs.

The State of Washington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Highland Milk Condensing Company,

Petitioner,

506 vs.

David W. Phillips, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Clemente Liscio,

Petitioner,

507 vs.

Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Oriole Phonograph Company, Hetrick Manufacturing Company, et al.,

Petitioners,

508 vs.

Kansas City Fabric Products Company, The Schooley Stationery Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Charles G. Martin,

Petitioner,

512 vs.

A. M. Martin, J. E. Gray and United Fuel Gas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Gulf Smokeless Coal Company and
Roberts and Schaefer Co.,
Petitioners,
529 vs.
Sutton, Steele & Steele and
American Coal Cleaning Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

E. A. Wildermuth,
Petitioner,
532 vs.
Hazeltine Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Max Gutierrez, The Commissioners of the
Nuestra Senora de Belen Community
Ditch, et al.,
Petitioners,
544 vs.
The Middle Rio Grande Conservancy
District, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

O R D E R.

It is ordered that the following rule be adopted and established as an addition to the General Orders in Bankruptcy:

"XLVI

"Whenever a custodian, receiver or trustee is a banking institution designated and qualified pursuant to section 61 of the Act to act as depositary for money, said banking institution may, if authorized by rule of the local Bankruptcy Court approved by a majority of the Circuit Judges of the Circuit, keep on deposit with itself money received by it as custodian, receiver or trustee, if said banking institution under the local laws of the state of its domicile is permitted to keep on deposit with itself money collected and received by it acting as receiver or trustee under the appointment of any court. Such local rule shall contain such provisions for the supervision and control of such deposits as the court may deem adequate, and on all sums of money not less than $100 so kept on deposit interest shall be allowed by such banking institution at such rate, not less than two per centum per annum, as may from time to time be directed by local rule."

It is further ordered that Rule XXXIX, promulgated April 12, 1925 (267 U. S. 613), be amended to read as follows:

"XXXIX

"Representation of creditors by receivers or their attorneys.

"Neither a receiver nor his attorney shall solicit any proof of debt, power of attorney or other authority to act for or represent any creditor for any purpose in connection with the administration of the estate in bankruptcy or the acceptance or rejection of anycomposition offered by a bankrupt. The local Bankruptcy Court may, however, whenever a banking institution is under local rule or practice always appointed receiver in cases requiring the services of a receiver, by local rule approved by a majority of the Circuit Judges of the Circuit, provide that notice may be given to the creditors of the availability of such institution to act as trustee if elected, and may provide means to facilitate the creditors in filing and voting their claims in favor of the election of such institution as trustee."

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
546 vs.
Provident Trust Company of Pennsylvania, et al., etc.;
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
547 vs.
Girard Trust Company and Joseph L. Woolston, Executors, etc.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul M. Myers for the respondents.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
530 vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York, et al.

The suggestion of a diminution of the record and the motion for writ of certiorari were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll C. Walter for the respondents in support thereof, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Nat M. Lacy, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

Ex Parte:
Axel Hagenson, Petitioner.
—, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for writ of prohibition herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Winter S. Martin for the petitioner.

The Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
454 vs.
William Lowe, Doing Business under the Trade Name of Capitol Hill Gin Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. P. Freeling for the appellants.

Emmett Cochran, et al., Appellants, vs. Louisiana State Board of Education, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, Mr. Daniel C. Roper, and Mr. W. D. Jamieson for the appellants.
468	
Yamhill Electric Company, Appellant, vs. The City of McMinnville, Oregon, etc., et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter L. Tooze, Jr., for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. John P. Kavanaugh for the appellees in opposition thereto.
470	
Southern California Edison Company, Appellant, vs. Railroad Commission of the State of California, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. C. Mullendore and Mr. Roy W. Reppy for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Edwin P. Werner, Mr. Arthur T. George, and Mr. William B. Mathews for the appellees in opposition thereto.
475	
Gabriel Toombs, Appellant, vs. Citizens Bank of Waynesboro.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. E. Sutton for the appellant.
485	
Helen M. Slemp, Appellant, vs. City of Tulsa, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Randolph Shirk for the appellant.
490	

J. P. Grubb, Appellant, 491 vs. The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Andrew Wilson for the appellant.
The United States of America, Appellant, 509 vs. Francisco Unzeuta.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, and Mr. W. H. Ramsey for the appellant.
Harmar Coal Company, Petitioner, 513 vs. D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Seifert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. H. Conner, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. L. H. Bayliss for the respondent.
Indianola Coal Company, Petitioner, 514 vs. D. B. Heiner, Collector, etc.; Indianola Coal Company, Petitioner, 515 vs. C. G. Lewellyn, formerly Collector, etc.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Seifert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. H. Conner, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. L. H. Bayliss for the respondents.

Bessemer Coal & Coke Company,
Petitioner,
516 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.;
Bessemer Coal & Coke Company,
Petitioner,
517 vs.
C. C. Lewellyn, formerly Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Seifert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. H. Connor, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. L. H. Bayliss for the respondents.

P. G. Walker, Jr., et al.,
Petitioners,
518 vs.
Traylor Engineering & Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilson A. Chase for the petitioners.

Lion Laboratories, Inc., and Max Daub,
Petitioners,
521 vs.
Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Dickerman Williams for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John Henry McEvers, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondents.

Bank of China, et al.,
Petitioners,
527 vs.
R. T. McDonnell, Assignee, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Hinckley and Mr. Henry M. Campbell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Alfred Sutro and Mr. Cornell S. Franklin for the respondents.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
530 vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, and Mr. George C. Butte for the petitioner and by Mr. Carroll T. Walter and Mr. Almond D. Cochran for the respondents.

Emlenton Refining Company,
Petitioner,
534 vs.
Walter A. Chambers, Trading as G. L. P. Chambers & Co., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David A. Reed for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. T. Manning, Jr., for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
546 vs.
Provident Trust Company, etc.;
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
547 vs.
Girard Trust Company, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the petitioners.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior,
Petitioner,
77 vs.
United States of America ex rel. Mary I. Kadrie, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Webster Ballinger for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the petitioner.

Ruffin Collie, Clinton Cooke, and Robbie Howe,

Petitioners,

423 vs.

Thomas D. Fergusson, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Jacob L. Morewitz for the petitioners, and the case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leon T. Seawell and Mr. Henry Bowden for the respondents.

Florsheim Brothers Drygoods Co., Ltd.,

Petitioner,

118 vs.

The United States of America;

Thomas W. White, Collector of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

414 vs.

Hood Rubber Company.

The argument of these cases were commenced by Mr. James Craig Peacock for the petitioner in No. 118, continued by Mr. Harold C. Haskell for the respondent in No. 414, and by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent in No. 118 and petitioner in No. 414.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that Samuel McComas Hawkin, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that George H. Harlan, Esquire, of Sansalito, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward Clifford, It is ordered that James M. Parley, Esquire, of Hutchinson, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry M. Ward, It is ordered that Harry A. Fellows, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Florsheim Brothers Drygoods Company, Ltd., Petitioner, 118 vs. The United States of America; Thomas W. White, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 414 vs. Hood Rubber Company.	The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent in No. 118 and for the petitioner in No. 414; and concluded by Mr. Harold C. Haskell for the respondent in No. 414.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 356 vs. The Pilliod Lumber Company.	This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry M. Ward for the respondent.
Harry C. Moore, as Treasurer of Grant County, Indiana, Petitioner, 79 vs. Sidney Z. Mitchell and Niel A. Weathers, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Henry M. Dowling for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Connick for the respondent.
Employers' Liability Assurance Corporation, etc., Petitioner, 81 vs. Mrs. Myrtis Cook, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Sam C. Polk for the respondent.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Small, It is ordered that Albert L. Cox, Esquire, of Raleigh, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Coombe, It is ordered that William E. Barkman and Israel J. Mendelson, Esquires, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles V. Imlay, It is ordered that J. Blaine McGoun, Esquire, of Beaver Falls, State of Pennsylvania, and William David Craig, Esquire, of Beaver, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Waterman, It is ordered that Colin A. Smith, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, It is ordered that Josiah Whitnel, Esquire, of East St. Louis, State of Illinois, and Otis F. Glenn, Esquire, of Murphysboro, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Thomas E. Troland, Esquire, of New London, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Employers' Liability Assurance Corporation, etc., Petitioner,
81 vs.
Mrs. Myrtis Cook, et al.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Sam C. Polk for the respondents, and the case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. A. Vinson and Mr. Clyde A. Sweeton for the petitioner.

The Baltimore & Ohio Southwestern R. R. Company, Petitioner,
87 vs.
Lula Carroll, Administratrix, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. William A. Eggers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar H. Montgomery for the respondent.

The Texas and Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
89 vs.
Mrs. Wallace Guidry, Administratrix, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. H. T. Bibb for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Anita H. Cooper, Petitioner,
93 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Wayne Johnson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the respondent.

Robert H. Lucas, as
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

92 vs.

North Texas Lumber Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that Paul H. Arthur, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul D. Spearman, It is ordered that Thaddeus H. Brown, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dwight B. Galt, It is ordered that David J. Brophy, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert Mac C. Barnes, Jr., It is ordered that John Elmer Mead, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Seifert, It is ordered that William Wallace Booth, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Adelin, It is ordered that Meyer Abrams, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Maurice Sugarman and Jud Purdue,
Petitioners,
560 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion in behalf of counsel for the petitioner for leave to file a brief in support of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause within 15 days,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, with leave to the respondent to reply thereto within 20 days thereafter, per stipulation of counsel.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
92 vs.
The North Texas Lumber Company.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the petitioner, and the case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert B. Hall for the respondent.

William J. Stratton, Secretary of State, etc.,
Appellant,
98 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Bayard Lacey Catron for the appellant, and by Mr. Josiah Whitnel for the appellee.

National Fire Insurance Company of Hartford,

Appellant,

104 vs.

Joseph B. Thompson, Superintendent, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Robert J. Folonie for the appellant, and by Mr. John T. Barker and Mr. Floyd E. Jacobs for the appellees.

Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,

Petitioner,

113 vs.

R. L. Bryant, Administrator, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. M. Perry for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy St. Lewis, It is ordered that Grester H. LaMar and Roscoe Rizley, Esquires, of Guymon, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Neave, It is ordered that Stephen H. Philbin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Coleman L. Blease, It is ordered that A. C. Hinds, Esquire, of Kingstree, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George J. Feldman, It is ordered that Peter Glunts, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Eugene A. Bond, Esquire, of Leadville, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Curry, It is ordered that Roscoe B. Stephenson, Esquire, of Covington, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney S. Alderman, It is ordered that S. F. Hobbs, Esquire, of Selma, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,
Petitioner,
113 vs.
R. L. Bryant, Administrator, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. J. M. Perry for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Charles Curry for the respondent.

Frederick C. Renziehausen,
Petitioner,
114 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

This case was argued by Mr. William A. Seifert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.

Federal Radio Commission,
Petitioner,
122 vs.
General Electric Company, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Bethuel M. Webster, Jr., for the petitioner, pro hac vice, by special leave of Court.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that Adrian Bonnelly, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest L. Averill, It is ordered that Raymond A. Johnson, Esquire, of Manchester, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Hostetler, It is ordered that Ralph E. Atherton, Esquire, of Schenectady, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Sidney P. Chandler, Esquire, of Corpus Christi, State of Texas, and Roscoe Runge, Esquire, of Mason, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly, It is ordered that David C. Broderick, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Thomas Penney, Jr., Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that Tom W. Campbell, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Hugh R. Robertson, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Ohio on the Relation of
John C. Popovici, Vice Consul of
Roumania,

Petitioner,

vs.

Abram W. Agler, Charles Kirchbaum, and
Edwin W. Diehl, Judges of the Court of
Common Pleas of Stark County, Ohio.

On writ of certiorari to the
Supreme Court of the State of
Ohio.

35

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the final order of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Holmes announced the following orders of the Court:

The Texas and Pacific Railway Company,

Petitioner,

89 vs.

Mrs. Wallace Guidry, Administratrix of the Estate of Wallace Guidry, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Sixth Supreme Judicial District of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Yamhill Electric Company,

Appellant,

470 vs.

The City of McMinnville, Oregon, etc., et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Yamhill Electric Company,

Appellant,

470 vs.

The City of McMinnville, Oregon, etc., et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Southern California Edison Company,

Appellant,

475 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, City of Los Angeles, a municipal corporation, Board of Water and Power Commissioners of said City.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Southern California Edison Company,

Appellant,

475 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, City of Los Angeles, a municipal corporation, Board of Water and Power Commissioners of said City.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of California as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, etc., et al., Appellants, 454 vs. William Lowe, Doing Business under the Trade Name of Capitol Hill Gin Company.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Emmett Cochran, et al., Appellants, 468 vs. Louisiana State Board of Education, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America, Appellant, 509 vs. Francisco Unzeuta.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Gabriel Toombs, Appellant, 485 vs. Citizens Bank of Waynesboro.

It is now here ordered by this Court that further consideration of the question of jurisdiction in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Helen M. Slemp, Appellant, 490 vs. City of Tulsa, et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that further consideration of the question of jurisdiction in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

J. P. Grubb, a natural person, etc., Appellant,
491 vs.
The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that further consideration of the question of jurisdiction in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
530 vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York, Murray, Aldrich & Roberts, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
546 vs.
Provident Trust Company of Pennsylvania and Charles Sinkler, Administrator, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Girard Trust Company and Joseph L. Woolston, Executors, etc.	Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below

547

which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Provident Trust Company of Pennsylvania, et al.; Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Girard Trust Company, et al.	On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument following the hearing of case No. 428. Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

546

547

Harmar Coal Company, Petitioner, vs. D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.	On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

513

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Indianola Coal Company,

Petitioner,

514 vs.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Indianola Coal Company,

Petitioner,

515 vs.

C. G. Lewellyn, formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Bessemer Coal & Coke Company,

Petitioner,

516 vs.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Bessemer Coal & Coke Company,

Petitioner,

517 vs.

C. C. Lewellyn, formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

P. C. Walker, Jr., O. K. Eysenbach and Kate C. Stebbins, Administratrix of the estate of Grant C. Stebbins, deceased,

Petitioners,

518 vs.

Traylor Engineering & Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Lion Laboratories, Inc. and Max Daub,

Petitioners,

521 vs.

Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Bank of China, Bank of Communications,
Exchange Bank of China, et al.,
Petitioners,
527 vs.
R. T. McDonnell, Assignee, American
Overseas Warehouse Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Emlenton Refining Company,
Petitioner,
534 vs.
Walter A. Chambers, Trading as
G. L. P. Chambers & Co. to use of
James M. Adams, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

O R D E R.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, January 27, until Monday, February 24, next.

The United States of America,

548 vs.

Mattie Puckett Worley, Administratrix, etc.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for The United States of America.

Arthur J. Aubrey and John A. Callan,
Appellants,

426 vs.

Mahoning Valley Sanitary District, etc.

The motion of Arthur J. Aubrey and John A. Callan to dismiss, and the motion of Josephine Gottlieb for leave to intervene were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry J. Gerrity in behalf of counsel for the appellants and for Pauline Gottlieb.

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,

13, Original. vs.

The State of Massachusetts.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Bentley W. Warren for the defendant, leave was granted to file substitute brief of the defendant in opposition to (1) motion to dismiss the defendant's answer; (2) motion to strike out portions of defendant's answer, and leave was granted to file reprint of answer.

Clarence L. Johnson, A. P. Bonner, L. A. Vaughan, et al.,
Appellants,

538 vs.

State Highway Commission of South Carolina.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Daniel, Mr. Cordie Page, Mr. William C. Wolfe, and Mr. H. E. Whiting for the appellees in support thereof, and by Mr. L. G. Southard for the appellants in opposition thereto.

The State of Florida, and A. S. Wells, E. S. Matthews, et al., etc., Appellants, 493 vs. The United States of America, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred H. Davis and Mr. T. T. Turnbull for the appellants.
Brooks-Scanlon Corporation, et al., Appellants, 494 vs. The United States of America, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. August S. Gutheim and Mr. H. P. Adair for the appellants.
Wilson Lumber Company of Florida, Appellant, 495 vs. The United States of America, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. V. Norman for the appellant.
C. L. Crawford, in his individual capacity, etc., Appellant, 499 vs. Superior Court of the State of California, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. L. Crawford, pro se, in support thereof, and by Mr. George H. Harlan, Mr. Thomas P. Boyd, and Mr. U. S. Webb for the appellees in opposition thereto.
Howard M. Hanna, as Executor, etc., Petitioner, 503 vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Heber Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe, Mr. Charles F. Kincheloe, Mr. Fred K. Dyar, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Jose Candara,
Petitioner,
519 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward I. Barry for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Farnum, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Lektophone Corporation,
Petitioner,
520 vs.
The Rola Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Davis and Mr. Charles E. Hughes for the petitioner.

Little Four Oil & Gas Company, a Trust,
Petitioner,
522 vs.
C. G. Lewellyn, formerly Collector, etc.;
Little Four Oil & Gas Company, a Trust,
Petitioner,
523 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William G. Heiner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. H. Conner, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. L. L. Baylies for the respondents.

Broad River Power Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
528 vs.
State of South Carolina ex rel. John M. Daniel, Attorney General.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the petitioners, and by Mr. John M. Daniel, Mr. Cordie Page, and Mr. W. S. Nelson for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
531 vs.
Mike Begley.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William P. Waggener and Mr. J. M. Challis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred Robertson for the respondent.

E. W. Roach,
Petitioner,
533 vs.
Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M. Morris for the petitioner, and by Mr. George H. Smith for the respondent.

L. M. Willcuts, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
535 vs.
Charles W. Bunn.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, and Mr. Newall Key for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Bunn for the respondent.

Edwin J. Brach, Emily Upton Brach, et al.,
Petitioners,
537 vs.
E. C. Moen.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward R. Johnston and Mr. Henry J. Darby for the petitioners, and by Mr. Joseph P. Shoup for the respondent.

National Surety Company,
Petitioner,
540 vs.
Austin Machinery Corporation, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marion G. Evans and Mr. J. W. Cutrer for the petitioner, and by Mr. William P. Metcalf for the respondents.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
543 vs.
D. O. Ramey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry R. Stocker and Mr. Edward J. White for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ed. L. Abington, and Mr. Carl G. Abington and John W. Campbell, for the respondent.

Federal Radio Commission,
Petitioner,
122 vs.
General Electric Company and People of the State of New York.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Bethuel M. Webster, Jr., for the petitioner, pro hac vice, by special leave of Court. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The argument on the motions to strike out certain parts of the answer and to dismiss the answer was commenced by Mr. Benedict M. Holden for the complainant and continued by Mr. Ernest L. Averill for the complainant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The State of Connecticut, Complainant,
vs.
13, Original.
The State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the motions of the Complainant to strike out certain parts of the answer of the Defendant and to dismiss answer of the defendant, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and they are hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered by this Court that the Complainant file its reply to the answer of the defendant within one week from this date.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,
vs.
17, Original.
The State of New York and The City of New York.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Duane E. Minard for the complainant.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,
vs.
17, Original.
The State of New York and The City of New York.

On consideration of the motion of complainant for leave to withdraw the motion to set this cause for hearing on the bill and answer,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,
vs.
17, Original.
The State of New York and The City of New York.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for each defendant in thiscause for leave to file by tomorrow a joint motion for the appointment of a special master herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
66 vs.
Harry M. Wurzbach.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the appellant, and by Mr. Hugh R. Robertson for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 21, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence J. Heller, It is ordered that Orva Orris Vrooman, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard D. Daniels, It is ordered that Martin J. Teigan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Thomas F. Dolan, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, It is ordered that Edward F. Peters, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. E. Steinem, It is ordered that Edward B. Levy, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. S. Musgrave, It is ordered that Frederick A. Lind, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, and Thad M. Talcott, Jr., Esquire, of South Bend, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Barrett Prettyman, It is ordered that Harold Richard Kelly, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond C. Young, It is ordered that Frank W. Stonecipher, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Lamar C. Jeeligson and Charles W. Anderson, Esquires, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

The following order was entered:

O R D E R.

The Clerk of this Court having reported to the Court that a deficit amounting to $15,015.90 is shown in his annual return to the Attorney General of the United States for the year 1929, which deficit is occasioned by the failure to earn sufficient moneys by fees and costs collected to meet the payments of his compensation and general office expenses;

It is now here ordered by this Court that the Clerk of this Court be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transfer and pay over from the Special Fund in his custody, held pursuant to the orders of this Court of June 6, 1927, into the general funds in his hands as such Clerk, the sum of $15,015.90 to meet the said deficit in his annual accounts for the year 1929 as shown in his annual return to the Attorney General of the United States covering receipts and expenses for that period.

(Signed) Oliver Wendell Holmes
Associate Justice of the Supreme
Court of the United States.

Universal Battery Company,
Petitioner,
127 vs.
The United States;
Vesta Battery Corporation,
Petitioner,
275 vs.
The United States;
The Bassick Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
350 vs.
The United States;
F. W. Stewart Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
351 vs.
The United States;
Gemco Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
352 vs.
The United States.

These cases were argued by Mr. George Maurice Morris for the petitioners in Nos. 127 and 275, by Mr. George M. Wilmeth for the petitioners in Nos. 350, 351, and 352, and by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Universal Battery Company,
Petitioner,
127 vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Ralph C. Williamson for the respondent in support thereof, and by Mr. George Maurice Morris for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

The Bassick Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
350 vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Ralph C. Williamson for the respondent.

The United States, Petitioner, 128 vs. American Can Company; The United States, Petitioner, 129 vs. Missouri Can Company; The United States, Petitioner, 130 vs. Detroit Can Company.	These cases were argued by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Graham Sumner for the respondents.
Thos. A. Early, as Receiver of the Farmers & Merchants National Bank of Lake City, S. C., 133 vs. J. L. Richardson.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. R. E. Whiting for Thos. A. Early, as receiver, etc.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Benton, It is ordered that Isaac Mayo Bailey, Esquire, of Raleigh, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. M. Horn, It is ordered that William M. Byrnes, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that George H. Carter, Esquire, of Marlin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Barry Mohun, It is ordered that Marcellus C. Eckhardt, Jr., Esquire, of Corpus Christi, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thos. A. Early, as Receiver of the Farmers & Merchants National Bank of Lake City, S. C.,
133 vs.
J. L. Richardson.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. R. E. Whiting for Thos. A. Early, as receiver, etc., and concluded by Mr. A. C. Hinds for J. L. Richardson.

Piedmont and Northern Railway Company and National Association of Railroads, etc.,
Appellants,
164 vs.
United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Southern Railway Company, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. S. O'B. Robinson, Jr., for the appellant, Piedmont and Northern Railway Company; continued by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the appellees, the United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission; by Mr. Sidney S. Alderman for the appellees, Southern Railway Company, et al.; and concluded by Mr. John E. Benton for the appellant, the National Association of Railroads and Utilities Commissioners.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway & Western & Atlantic R.R.,
Appellants,
165 vs.
Mrs. Clyde Morgan and The Nash Motor Sales Co.

This case was argued by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the appellants, and the case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. B. Sizer for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 23, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Mark McGee, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas; J. O. Guleke, Esquire, of Amarillo, State of Texas; and Edward S. Boyles, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as Attorneys and Counsellors of this Court, and they were sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. D. Jamieson, It is ordered that Walter W. L. Meyer, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry A. Estep, It is ordered that Arthur P. Schmidt, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson Trottman, It is ordered that Aaron M. Sargent, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Fremont Evans, Esquire, of St. Joseph, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,
Petitioner,
179 vs.
John F. Guenther.

This case was argued by Mr. C. M. Horn for the petitioner, and by Mr. William M. Byrnes for the respondent.

James C. Davis, Federal Agent, et al.,
Petitioners,
188 vs.
Mrs. Mary Preston, Administratrix.

This case was argued by Mr. W. L. Cook for the petitioners, and by Mr. Robert L. Cole for the respondent. Leave was granted the petitioners to file brief within fifteen days on the question of substitution and leave was granted respondent to file reply thereto within three days thereafter.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company,
193 vs.
O. N. Lindell.

This case was argued by Mr. Nelson Trottman for the Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, and the case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. DeJournel for O. N. Lindell.

State of Texas ex rel. T. H. Isensee, et al.,
Appellants,
245 vs.
Dee Sims, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. M. G. Eckhardt, Jr., for the Appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 24, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry A. Craig, It is ordered that Horace Michener Dechell, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wright Patman, It is ordered that Hugh Carney, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Gray, It is ordered that Robert Levin, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

State of Texas ex rel. T. H. Ibensee, et al., Appellants,

245 vs.

Dee Sims, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. M. G. Eckhardt, Jr., for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

State of Texas, ex rel. T. H. Isensee,
R. Morgan, J. S. Byerly, et al.,
Appellants,
245 vs.
Dee Sims, D. C. Cryor, I. S. York,
et al., etc.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

D. S. Murphey,
Appellant,
184 vs.
The Corporation Commission of the State of North Carolina.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. A. Jones for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The Hanover Fire Insurance Company of New York,
Appellant,
167 vs.
Max Specktor, Abram Larner, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Horace Michener Schell for the appellant, and by Mr. William A. Gray for the appellees.

District of Columbia,
Petitioner,
229 vs.
Charles H. Fred, alias Hamilton C. Fred.

This case was argued by Mr. Richmond B. Keech for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. McComas Hawkin for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 27, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew Wilson, It is ordered that John F. Carlisle, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. S. Y. Ivins, It is ordered that Morris H. Frank, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert S. Lisenby, It is ordered that Walter C. Blakely, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson T. Hartson, It is ordered that Charles L. Smith, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that Kenneth M. Spence, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Jesse W. Clarke, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-first District of New York,

Petitioner,

68 vs.

The Haberle Crystal Springs Brewing Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Concurring: Mr. Justice McReynolds, and Mr. Justice Stone.

Frederick C. Renziehausen,

Petitioner,

114 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Concurring: Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Van Devanter announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex Parte:
Axel Hagenson, Petitioner.
—, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and for leave to file a petition for writ of prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
548 vs.
Mattie Puckett Worley, Administratrix, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and it is also ordered that case No. 463, Charles Jackson, petitioner, vs. The United States of America, be advanced and the two cases are assigned for argument as one case on Monday, March 3, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Arthur J. Aubrey and John A. Callan,
Appellants,
426 vs.
Mahoning Valley Sanitary District, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to dismiss as to the parties appellants, Aubrey and Callan, and of the motion of Pauline Gottlieb for leave to intervene and to be substituted as the party appellant in this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Clarence L. Johnson, A. P. Bonner, L. A. Vaughan, et al., Appellants,

538 vs.

State Highway Commission of South Carolina, John G. Richards, Governor, etc., et al.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the motion of counsel for the appellees in this cause to dismiss or to affirm be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits, and the cause is advanced and assigned for argument at the head of the assigned cases for Monday, February 24th next.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,

17, Original. vs.

The State of New York and the City of New York.

On consideration of the motion for the appointment of a special master in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that Charles H. Burch, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, appointed special master in this cause, with power to issue subpoenas for witnesses and to take such evidence as may be introduced and such as he may deem necessary. The master is directed to make findings of fact and conclusions of law, and to submit the same to this Court with all convenient speed, together with his recommendations for a decree. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the special master shall be subject to consideration, rejection, revision, or approval by the Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The United States of America, Appellant,

509 vs.

Francisco Unzeuta.

It is ordered that this criminal case upon the docket be, and it is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, March 10th next.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway and the Western & Atlantic Railroad,

Appellants,

vs.

Mrs. Clyde Morgan and The Nash Motor Sales Company.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

165

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Tennessee.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

D. S. Murphey,

Appellant,

vs.

The Corporation Commission of the State of North Carolina.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

184

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Hanover Fire Insurance Company of New York,

Appellant,

167 vs.

Max Specktor, Abram Larner, and Max Peck, Trading as Specktor, Larner, and Peck.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Hanover Fire Insurance Company of New York, Appellant,

167 vs.

Max Specktor, Abram Larner, and Max Peck, Trading as Specktor, Larner, and Peck.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The State of Florida and A. S. Wells, et al., etc.,

Appellants,

493 vs.

The United States of America, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Brooks-Scanlon Corporation, et al., Appellants,
494 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Wilson Lumber Company of Florida, Appellant,
495 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

C. L. Crawford, in his individual capacity, etc., Appellant,
499 vs.
Superior Court of the State of California, etc., et al.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing on the merits; and the case is advanced and set for hearing on Monday, February 24th next, immediately after the hearing of case No. 538, heretofore advanced and placed at the head of the assigned cases for that day.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Lektophone Corporation, Petitioner,
520 vs.
The Rola Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Broad River Power Company, Columbia Railway Gas and Electric Company and F. D. Campbell,

Petitioners,

528 vs.

State of South Carolina ex rel. John M. Daniel, Attorney General.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

L. M. Willcuts, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Minnesota,

Petitioner,

535 vs.

Charles W. Bunn.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Howard M. Hanna, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of H. Melville Hanna, Deceased,

Petitioner,

503 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Jose Gandara,

Petitioner,

519 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Little Four Oil & Gas Company, a Trust,

Petitioner,

522 vs.

C. C. Lewellyn, formerly Collector of Internal Revenue, 23rd District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Little Four Oil & Gas Company, a Trust,

Petitioner,

523 vs.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, 23rd District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
531 vs.
Mike Begley.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

E. W. Roach,
Petitioner,
533 vs.
Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Edwin J. Brach, Emily Upton Brach and Aurora C. Upton,
Petitioners,
537 vs.
E. C. Moen.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

National Surety Company,

Petitioner,

540 vs.

Austin Machinery Corporation and Austin Machinery Corporation for the use of Metropolitan Trust Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

543 vs.

D. O. Ramey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

George L. Vincent,

Petitioner,

597 vs.

The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Conlon for the petitioner.

The State of Wisconsin, et al., Complainants,
7, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.;
The State of Michigan, Complainant,
11, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.;
The State of New York, Complainant,
12, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.

Upon consideration of the motion of the defendants in these causes for a reassignment of the same for final hearing and for a direction respecting the condensation of the evidence to be considered on such hearing it is,

Ordered, That these causes be set down for final hearing on Wednesday, March 12 next, upon the report of the special master made on the rereference and upon any exceptions or objections taken thereto; and it is further,

Ordered, That the parties make and cause to be printed and filed with the clerk on or before February 20 next a condensation or joint abstract of so much of the evidence taken before the special master as may be necessary to a proper consideration and determination of such exceptions or objections as may be taken to the special master's report on the rereference, and that in any instance where the parties are unable to agree upon a proper condensation of particular evidence the same shall be set forth at length in such abstract.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The State of New York and The City of New York.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a reply to the amended answer of the defendant, The City of New York,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The State of Oklahoma,
Complainant,
6, Original. vs.
The State of Texas, et al.

The motion of the State of Texas to approve the report of expenses of the commissioner herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. G. Calhoun for the defendant, the State of Texas.

J. P. Grubb, a natural person, etc.,
Appellant,
491 vs.
The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gilbert Bettman and Mr. A. R. Johnson, Jr., for the appellees in support thereof, and by Mr. Andrew Wilson and Mr. John F. Carlisle for the appellant, in opposition thereto.

James Morrison,
Petitioner,
600 vs.
The Warden of the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Morrison, pro se.

Ex parte:
Joseph Murray, also known as William O'Brien, Appellant,
500

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roland Beesey and Mr. William F. Herron for the appellant.

Charles E. Dropps,
Petitioner,
501 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Dropps, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Michael Gaglione,
Petitioner,
539 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Lewis and Mr. Matthew L. McGrath for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
541 vs.
Ralph Contrella, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Eckert and Mr. Allen T. C. Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. Fred Mercer for the respondents.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
542 vs.
Mary Perucca, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Eckert and Mr. Allen T. C. Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. Fred Mercer for the respondents.

Lem Motlow and Ophelia Motlow,
Petitioners,
549 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Houts and Mr. P. H. Cullen for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Marie Bevington,
Petitioner,
550 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas F. Bevington for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Chicago North Shore & Milwaukee Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
552 vs.
D. W. Ellis.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar L. Wood and Mr. A. L. Gardner for the petitioner.

The Fairfax Drainage District, etc.,
Petitioner,
553 vs.
Kansas City, Missouri.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. M. Lillard for the petitioner, and by Mr. John T. Barker, Mr. J. C. Petherbridge, and Mr. Fred Robertson for the respondent.

Noah Crooks, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
556 vs.
Benjamin Harrelson, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John Vaughan Groner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank S. Bright and Mr. S. L. Swarts for the respondents.

The City of Newark,

Petitioner,

559 vs.

William M. Mills, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the petitioner, and by Mr. Horace L. Cheyney for the respondents.

Davies Motors, Inc.,

Petitioner,

569 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Duane R. Dills for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, February 24 next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1930.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Sleman, It is ordered that H. Hanson Drummond McKenney, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank J. Hogan, It is ordered that William K. Young, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Littlepage, It is ordered that Homer B. Aikman, Esquire, of Terre Haute, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. McCarron, It is ordered that Harold E. Simpson, Esquire, of Ithaca, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. E. Whiting, It is ordered that C. C. Wyche, Esquire, of Spartanburg, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Vallance, It is ordered that Charles E. Snyder, Esquire, of Herkimer, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George J. Feldman, It is ordered that John P. Kirby, Esquire, of Chicopee, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Vallance, It is ordered that William A. Roberts, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer W. Hall, It is ordered that Hal M. Stone, Esquire, of Bloomington, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Carter, It is ordered that Casper A. Ornbaun, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Evans, It is ordered that A. T. W. Manning, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wellmore B. Turner, It is ordered that Guy H. Wells, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Daniel, It is ordered that J. Ivey Humphrey, Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John S. Barbour, It is ordered that Theodore H. Lord, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Hamel, It is ordered that Lloyd E. Anderson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John T. Scott, It is ordered that John H. Watson, Jr., Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. McCarron, It is ordered that Howard Cobb, Esquire, of Ithaca, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Boyd, It is ordered that Harry W. Morgan, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred P. Thom, Sr., It is ordered that Alfred P. Thom, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan G. Sanders, It is ordered that Walter J. Freund, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry A. Estep, It is ordered that Henry A. Jones, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lloyd H. Sutton, It is ordered that Howard M. Cox, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Conlon,, It is ordered that W. Carl Wyatt, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Conlon, It is ordered that Hardee E. Wyatt, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan G. Sanders, It is ordered that Abraham J. Isserman, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Morgan G. Sanders, It is ordered that Seymour J. Solomon, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Hess, It is ordered that Ralph H. Henney, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that James Lawrence Fly, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard D. Daniels, It is ordered that Asbury Hayne de Yampert, Esquire, of New York City, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton W. Shreve, It is ordered that Harold F. Mook, Esquire, of Erie, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that Paul D. Miller, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that James Maxwell Fassett, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, it is ordered that Jack Boothe Blalock, Esquire, of Marshall, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Hess, It is ordered that Arthur M. Spiegel, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Hess, It is ordered that Ernest Osmon Ricketts, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Boyd, It is ordered that H. H. Hoppe, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. ..isson, it is ordered that Walter I. Sundlun, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James B. McDonough, Sr., It is ordered that James B. McDonough, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. Justice Holmes said:

"This is a moment of sorrow and of happiness to us. To our deep grief our beloved Chief Justice has been compelled by his health to resign. But it is a happiness to know that to fill his place as Chief Justice our old-time associate, Mr. Charles Evans Hughes, has been appointed. I understand that he is present, and the clerk will read his commission. Mr. Hughes then will take the oath, and the marshal will escort him to his seat upon the bench."

The clerk then read the commission as follows:

HERBERT HOOVER

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To all who shall see these presents, greeting:

Know ye, that reposing special trust and confidence in the wisdom, uprightness, and learning of Charles Evans Hughes, of New York, I have nominated, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him Chief Justice of the United States, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfil the duties of that office according to the Constitution and Laws of the said United States, and to have and to hold the said office, with all the powers, privileges, and emoluments to the same of right appertaining, unto him, the said Charles Evans Hughes, during his good behavior.

In testimony Whereof I have caused these letters to be made patent and the seal of the Department of Justice to be hereunto affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 13th day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirty, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and fifty-fourth.

(SEAL) Herbert Hoover.

By the President:

William D. Mitchell,

Attorney General.

The oath of office was then administered by the clerk and Mr. Chief Justice Hughes was escorted, by the marshal, to the seat of the Chief Justice on the bench.

District of Columbia,

Petitioner,

229 vs.

Charles H. Fred, Alias Hamilton C. Fred.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Ruffin Collie, Clinton Cook, and Robbie Rowe,

Petitioners,

423 vs.

Thomas D. Fergusson, F. W. Darling, and J. S. Darling, Trading as J. S. Darling & Son, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Illinois Central Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

75 vs.

G. I. Crail, Doing Business as P. McCoy Fuel Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Carley & Hamilton, Inc.; Edward Malde, Doing Business as A. B. C. Transfer & Storage Company; S. Brizzolara, etc., et al.,

Appellants,

86 vs.

Frank G. Snook, as Chief of the Division of Motor Vehicles, State of California.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Geo. T. Cottingham and William C. Meginnes, Doing Business as City Transfer Company, et al.,

Appellants,

267 vs.

Frank G. Snook, as Chief of Division of Motor Vehicles of the State of California, and Ray L. Riley, as State Controller of the State of California.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

District of Columbia,

Petitioner,

44 vs.

Georgiana Thompson.

On writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,

Petitioner,

179 vs.

John F. Guenther.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

C. A. Lindgren, Administrator of the Estate of C. E. Barford, Deceased,

Petitioner,

25 vs.

The United States of America and Colonna's Shipyard, Incorporated.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

The State of Oklahoma,

Complainant,

6, Original. vs.

The State of Texas, Defendant;

The United States of America,

Intervener.

It appearing from the statement dated October 21, 1929, filed herein by Samuel S. Gannett, Commissioner, as to the work done, time employed and expenses incurred by him in running, locating and marking the boundary line between the States of Texas and Oklahoma, along the one hundredth meridian of longitude west from Greenwich, as directed by the decree herein of January 3, 1927 (273 U. S. 93), by clause 7 of which it was ordered, adjudged and decreed that the costs of its execution, including the compensation and expenses of the Commissioner, should be borne in three equal parts by the two States and the United States, that the total net cost thereof, including the expenses of the Commissioner and his compensation at the rate of $25 per day, was $33,482.91, and that this entire amount has been paid by the State of Texas; and it further appearing from the motion filed herein by the State of Texas on January 27, 1930, that one-third of this amount has been refunded to the State of Texas by the State of Oklahoma but that no part thereof has been paid by the United States;

It is, on the motion of the State of Texas, ordered, adjudged and decreed that the Commissioner's said statement showing the cost of executing the decree be and is ratified, confirmed and approved, and that the United States repay to the State of Texas one-third thereof, namely, $11,160.97.

Announced by Mr. Justice Sanford.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

22 vs.

Guardian Trust Company, Henry C. Flower, Receiver.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and the decree of the District Court affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

92 vs.

North Texas Lumber Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed ~~with costs;~~ and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, a Corporation,
193 vs.
O. M. Lindell.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Harry C. Moore, as Treasurer of Grant County, Indiana,
Petitioner,
79 vs.
Sidney Z. Mitchell and Niel A. Weathers (Sued as Neil A. Weathers), as Executors of the Last Will and Testament of Richard Edwards Breed, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

New York Central Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

73 vs.

Antonia Ambrose, as Administratrix of the Estate of John Ambrose, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Hudson County, State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Hudson County, State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Circuit Court of Hudson County, State of New Jersey, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

87 vs.

Lula Carroll, Administratrix of the Estate of Guerney O. Burtch, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Thos. A. Early, as Receiver of the
Farmers and Merchants National Bank
of Lake City, S. C.,
133 vs.
J. L. Richardson.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

J. Du Pratt White, Franklin W. Hopkins,
Edward J. Partridge, et al.,
Appellants,
336 vs.
Sparkill Realty Corporation and
Standard Trap Rock Corporation.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York with directions to dismiss the bill of complaint.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Tagg Bros. & Moorhead, Richard M. Laverty, Engaged in Business Under the Name and Style of Laverty Bros.; Will H. Wood, et al., etc., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, Arthur M. Hyde, as Secretary of Agriculture; William D. Mitchell, Attorney General, et al.

45 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. American Code Company, Incorporated.

67 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; ~~with costs;~~ and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Florsheim Brothers Drygoods Company, Ltd., Petitioner,
118 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Thomas W. White, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
414 vs.
Hood Rubber Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Piedmont and Northern Railway Company and National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners,

Appellants,

164 vs.

United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Southern Railway Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of South Carolina with direction to dismiss the bill for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

402 vs.

Guaranty Trust Company of New York, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Anita H. Cooper,

Petitioner,

93 vs.

The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States,

Petitioner,

128 vs.

American Can Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States, Petitioner, vs. Missouri Can Company. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

129

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States, Petitioner, vs. Detroit Can Company. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

130

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Ap eals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by Counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

James C. Davis, Federal Agent,
Petitioner,
188 vs.
Mrs. Mary Preston, Administratrix.

On consideration of the motion for the substitution of Andrew W. Mellon, Federal Agent, as the party petitioner in this cause, in place of James C. Davis,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

James C. Davis, Federal Agent,
Petitioner,
188 vs.
Mrs. Mary Preston, Administratrix.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Superior Oil Company,
Appellant,
28 vs.
The State of Mississippi ex rel.
George T. Mitchell, Attorney General.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice Butler.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1930 - CONTINUED

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Harry M. Wurzbach. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

66

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Minerals Separation North American Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Magma Copper Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

71

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maine.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,

Petitioner,

113 vs.

R. L. Bryant, Administrator of the Estate of M. L. Bryant, deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Virginia.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

It is ordered by the court that the accompanying correspondence between members of the court and Mr. Chief Justice Taft upon his retirement as Chief Justice of the United States be this day spread upon the minutes and that it also be printed in the reports of the court.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D. C., February 10, 1930.

Dear Chief Justice:

We call you Chief Justice still, for we can not quickly give up the title by which we have known you for all these later years and which you have made so dear to us. We can not let you leave us without trying to tell you how dear you have made it. You came to us from achievements in other fields and with the prestige of the illustrious place that you lately had held, and you showed in a new form your voluminous capacity for work and for getting work done, your humor that smoothed the rough places, your golden heart that has brought you love from every side, and, most of all, from your brethern whose tasks you have made happy and light. We grieve at your illness, but your spirit has given life an impulse that will abide whether you are with us or are away.

Affectionately yours,

(Signed) Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
J. C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Geo. Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.

Hon. William H. Taft.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Washington, D. C., February 12, 1930.

My dear Brethren:

I can not adequately say how deeply I am touched by your affectionate letter. I regretted for many reasons the necessity of tendering my resignation, but none so strong as the ending of those pleasant associations with each and all of you, which during the past nine years have been so dear to me. Only the advice of my doctors and my own conviction that I would be unable to continue adequately the great work of the Court, forced me to leave you. That work, in your hands, will go on as well without me, but I am grateful, nevertheless, for your words of appreciation.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Wm. H. Taft.

Mr. Justice Holmes, Acting Chief Justice,
Mr. Justice Van Devanter,
Mr. Justice McReynolds,
Mr. Justice Brandeis,
Mr. Justice Sutherland,
Mr. Justice Butler,
Mr. Justice Sanford,
Mr. Justice Stone.

Thomas A. Baldwin, Thomas A. Baldwin, Executor of the Will of Carrie Pool Baldwin, et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error and Appellants,
417 vs.
State of Missouri.

Upon consideration of the return to the rule to show cause in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George L. Vincent,
Petitioner,
597 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George L. Vincent,
Petitioner,
597 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James Morrison,

Petitioner,

600 vs.

The Warden of the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James Morrison,

Petitioner,

600 vs.

The Warden of the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ex parte:

Joseph Murray, also known as William O'Brien,

500 Appellant,

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ex parte:

Joseph Murray, also known as William O'Brien,

500 Appellant.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

Treating the appeal herein from the Supreme Court of the State of California as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hugh W. Grant, Receiver, etc., Petitioner,

9 vs.

A. B. Leach & Company, Inc.

It is ordered that the printed opinion handed down in this case on January 6, 1930, be amended by striking out the last clause in the second sentence of section 1 at the top of page 2, reading "in exchange for 3,000 shares of the seven per cent preferred stock of the Furnace Company, at 85 and accrued dividends," and substituting therefor the following: "for which it paid partly in shares of the seven per cent preferred stock of the Furnace Company, at 85 and accrued dividends, and partly in cash."

Per Mr. Justice Sanford.

In the Matter of Albert T. Patrick:

It having been shown to the court that Albert T. Patrick, a member of the bar of this court, formerly of the New York State bar, and now, or lately, of Tulsa, Okla., has been disbarred from practice in the State of New York;

It is ordered that the clerk send notice to him and to the clerks of the highest courts of New York and Oklahoma, as provided in rule 2, paragraph 5 of the Rules of this court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

In the Matter of H. A. Ledbetter:

It having been shown to the court that H. A. Ledbetter, of Ardmore, Okla., a member of the bar of this court, and formerly of the Oklahoma State bar, has been disbarred from practice in the courts of that state;

It is ordered that the clerk send notice to him and to the clerk of the highest court of Oklahoma as provided in rule 2, paragraph 5 of the Rules of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Noah Crooks, Collector of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

556 vs.

Benjamin Harrelson, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Davies Motors, Inc.,

Petitioner,

569 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned with case No. 452, Richbourg Motor Company, Intervenor vs. United States of America, for argument as one case.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles E. Dropps,

Petitioner,

501 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Michael Saglione,

Petitioner,

539 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

541 vs.

Ralph Contrella and Catherine Contrella, his wife.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

542 vs.

Mary Perucca and Peter M. Perucca, her husband.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lem Motlow and Ophelia Motlow,
Petitioners,
549 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Marie Bevington,
Petitioner,
550 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago, North Shore & Milwaukee Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
552 vs.
D. W. Ellis.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Fairfax Drainage District of
Wyandotte County, Kansas,
Petitioner,
553 vs.
Kansas City, Missouri.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The City of Newark,
Petitioner,
559 vs.
William M. Mills and Andrew H. Mills, as former owners of the Steamer "South Shore."

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

S. O. Wynne, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.,
510 vs.
Swanson Chemical Corporation;
James M. Doran, Prohibition Commissioner of the United States, et al.
511 vs.
Martin H. Casper, trading as Delmar Manufacturing and Chemical Co.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claude R. Branch for Wynne and Doran .

Skinner and Eddy Corporation,
Petitioner,
605 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to postpone the submission of the petition for certiorari in this cause for two weeks,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, with leave to respondent to file brief by March 10th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

L. M. Willcuts, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
535 vs.
Charles W. Bunn.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Henry S. Manley, leave was granted to file a brief of the people of the State of New York, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

The State of New York,
Complainant,
12 Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file complainant's substitute exceptions to the report of the special master on re-reference,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company,
Appellant,
680 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. H. Hoppe for the appellants.

Harvey Cox, Appellant,
524 vs.
The People of the State of Colorado,
The Public Utilities Commission of
the State of Colorado, et al., etc.;
Harvey Cox, Appellant,
525 vs.
The People of the State of Colorado,
et al.;
Harvey Cox, Appellant,
526 vs.
The People of the State of Colorado,
et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file out of time the statement as to jurisdiction in these causes and that 20 days additional time to that prescribed by the rule be granted appellees within which to file statements opposing jurisdiction, per stipulations of counsel,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James Howard Snook,
Petitioner,
589 vs.
The State of Ohio.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur M. Spiegel for the petitioner, and the right to file brief in opposition thereto was waived by Mr. John J. Chester, Jr., for the respondent.

Henry R. Tyroler, et al.,
Petitioners,
634 vs.
Carl F. Routzahn, Collector of
Internal Revenue.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Charles B. McInnis, leave was granted to file a brief of George E. Holmes, Randolph E. Paul, and Valentine B. Havens, as amici curiae, in this cause.

Edward B. Weston, et al.,
Appellants,
574 vs.
Beaver-Remmers-Graham Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file an amendment to the designation of parts of record to be printed in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ex parte:
Buenaventura Lopez, Petitioner,
—, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Rohde for the petitioner.

Ex parte:
Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
21, Original.

The returns to the writ of mandamus by Hon. George M. Bourquin and Hon. Charles N. Pray, district judges of the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana, was presented to the Court.

Emmett Cochran, et al.,
Appellants,
468 vs.
Louisiana State Board of Education, et al.

The motion to dismiss the case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Percy Saint, Mr. Peyton R. Sandoz, Mr. Walter J. Burke, Mr. H. H. White, and Mr. R. F. White, for the appellees.

Mrs. Rebecca Grant,
Appellant,
663 vs.
Glynn Canning Company, et al.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Virgil E. Adam for the appellant.

Albert Turner,
Appellant,
484 vs.
W. P. Winters.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel A. King for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Charles M. Morris and Mr. Edward R. Callister for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Robert Carmahan,
Petitioner,
551 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank P. Walsh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Charles H. Stange,
Petitioner,
554 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. W. Spalding for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Morton Poe Fisher, Mr. Joseph H. Sheppard, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
555 vs.
Alfred E. Morris.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic L. Ballard for the respondent.

Charles Stockton,
Petitioner,
558 vs.
L. C. Massey (D. H. Stephenson),
Sheriff of Kanawha County.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Raymond Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Maurice Sugarman and Jud Purdue,
Petitioners,
560 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto Christensen and Mr. Samuel A. King for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Herbert Goudchaux,
Petitioner,
561 vs.
M. A. Joy, Receiver,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claude W. Dudley for the petitioner.

Michele Piccolella,
Petitioner,
562 vs.
Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Dickerman Williams and Mr. Carol Weiss King for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondents.

James H. Hooper,
Petitioner,
565 vs.
Philip Goldstein.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James H. Hooper, pro se, and by Mr. Sherman C. Spitzer for the respondent.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
566 vs.
Nellie Reardon, General Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic B. Scott and Mr. Walter J. Larrabee for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clement K. Corbin for the respondent.

The Continental National Bank,
Petitioner,
567 vs.
Holland Banking Company, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George L. Edwards and Mr. Edward J. White for petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe C. Patterson for the respondent.

Receivers of Gulf States Oil & Refining Corporation,
Petitioners,
568 vs.
Island Oil and Transport Corporation, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leavitt J. Hunt for the petitioners and by Mr. Francis L. Kohlman, Mr. Carl J. Austrian, Mr. Saul J. Lance, Mr. Charles A. Boston, and Mr. Wm. M. Chadbourne for the respondents.

The Royal Indemnity Company of New York, The Fidelity & Casualty Company of New York, et al.,
Petitioners,
571 vs.
L. A. Andrew, Superintendent of Banking of the State of Iowa, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Casper Schenk for the petitioners.

American Surety Company of New York,
Petitioner,
572 vs.
Henry Mullendore, Receiver.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sterling M. Wood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles H. Loud and Mr. William B. Leavitt for the respondent.

George A. Moffett and Benjamin Niport,
Petitioners,
575 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Isaac Lobe Strauss and Mr. Edgar Allan Poe for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Jess M. Caldwell,
Petitioner,
576 vs.
The United States of America;
Jess M. Caldwell,
Petitioner,
577 vs.
The United States of America.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mark Goode for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Robert A. Uihlein,
Petitioner,
578 vs.
City of St. Paul, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward S. Stringer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Eugene M. O'Neill and Mr. Lewis L. Anderson for the respondents.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 579 vs. Sanford & Brooks Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Helen R. Carloss, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Prew Savoy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles McH. Howard for the respondent.
Phoenix Building and Homestead Association, Petitioner, 580 vs. E. A. Carreres' Sons.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Royal E. Burnham for the petitioner.
Anna Uravic, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner, 581 vs. F. Jarka Company, Inc., et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Vernon S. Jones for the petitioner and by Mr. Arnie Adamson for the respondents.
Cincinnati, New Orleans and Texas Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, 582 vs. Mary A. McGill, as Administratrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Tennessee was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Weld Peck ~~and Mr. Horace M. Carr~~ for the petitioner and by Mr. W. T. Kennerly for the respondent.

Aldine Realty Company of Pittsburgh,
Petitioner,
585 vs.
Manor Real Estate and Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Stadtfeld for the petitioner, and by Mr. William S. Dalzell and Mr. Frederic D. McKenney for the respondent.

Titus A. Haffa,
Petitioner,
587 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Boddie for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Alabama Chemical Company,
Petitioner,
588 vs.
International Agricultural Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. H. Dent and Mr. Fred S. Ball for the petitioner, and by Mr. B. P. Crum, Mr. John D. Little, and Mr. Marion Smith for the respondent.

R. E. Graham and E. E. Foster, co-partners, etc.,
Petitioners,
589 vs.
Rex. B. Goodcell, Former Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Hughes for the petitioners and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
592 vs.
State of Florida ex rel. Fred H. Davis, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. B. Grier, Mr. W. E. May, and Mr. Thos. B. Adams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred H. Davis and Mr. Theo. T. Turnbull for the respondents.

Henderson County, State of Kentucky,
Petitioner,
593 vs.
State Bank of New York, et al.;
Henderson County, State of Kentucky,
Petitioner,
594 vs.
State Bank of New York, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James W. Henson and Mr. John C. Worsham for the petitioner and by Mr. Edmund F. Trabue for the respondents.

Henderson County, State of Kentucky,
Petitioner,
595 vs.
State Bank of New York, et al.;
Henderson County, State of Kentucky,
Petitioner,
596 vs.
State Bank of New York, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James W. Henson and Mr. John C. Worsham for the petitioner and by Mr. Edmund F. Trabue for the respondents.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
599 vs.
Mrs. Effie R. Bushey, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor and Mr. Edward J. White for the petitioner and by Mr. Frank Pace for the respondent.

Cheney Brothers, Petitioner, 601 vs. Doris Silk Corporation.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioner and by Mr. Jesse S. Epstein for the respondent.
George A. Gaston and J. W. Redmond, as Receivers, etc., Petitioners, 602 vs. Rutland Railroad Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. W. Redmond and Mr. Horace H. Powers for the petitioners and by Mr. Edwin W. Lawrence for the respondent.
S. L. Miller, A. J. Biddison, et al., etc. Petitioners, 603 vs. Annie Take, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. J. Biddison for the petitioners.
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner, 606 vs. Wilfred Garedpy, a minor, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. W. Root, Mr. A. G. Erdall, and Mr. O. W. Dynes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick M. Miner for the respondent.

Robert W. Bingham,
Petitioner,
608 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert N. Miller and Mr. J. Robert Sherrod for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Morton Poe Fisher, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

S. Homer Federman,
Petitioner,
609 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph G. M. Browne and Mr. Solon J. Carter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

City of New York,
Petitioner,
612 vs.
Federal Radio Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly and Mr. Joseph A. Devery for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Charles H. Weston, Mr. Marvin Smith, and Mr. Thad H. Brown for the respondent.

George Graham Rice, et al.,
Petitioners,
613 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Reed, Mr. Louis Titus, and Mr. John Wattawa for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Samuel D. Leidesdorf, as trustee, etc., Petitioner,
616 vs.
Union Indemnity Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bernard Hershkopf for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert H. Elder for the respondent.

McCord Radiator & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
619 vs.
Geza Horvath.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Beck, Mr. Charles E. Lewis, and Mr. Sherwin A. Hill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Merlin Wiley, Mr. O. L. Smith, and Mr. Robert Crosser for the respondent.

The Auglaize Box Board Company, Petitioner,
638 vs.
The Kansas City Fibre Box Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wellmore B. Turner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Murray Seasongood for the respondent.

Louis H. Ensten and Lion Knitting Mills Company, Petitioner,
650 vs.
Simon Aschler & Company, Incorporated.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. Ellery Edwards for the petitioners.

J. L. Morgan,

Appellant,

235 vs.

The State of Georgia.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court per stipulation.

Clarence L. Johnson, et al.,

Appellants,

538 vs.

The State Highway Commission of South Carolina, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. L. G. Southard for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

C. L. Crawford, in his individual capacity and on behalf of other protesting taxpayers,

Appellant,

499 vs.

Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Mendocino, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Casper A. Ornbaun for the appellant.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin B. Pettus, It is nordered that Frederick J. Singley, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. C. Robb, It is ordered that Bonifant Hamilton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude Nowlin, It is ordered that Maurice M. Thomas, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert L. Hopkins, It is ordered that Thomas P. Dudley, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert L. Hopkins, It is ordered that Harry B. Sutter, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert S. Regar, It is ordered that Robert P. Smith, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that Daniel W. Hone, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence C. Dill, It is ordered that Samuel B. Bassett, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard Boyd, It is ordered that Jose Lopez del Castillo, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Ellis Moore, It is ordered that Walter C. McMain, Esquire, of Youngstown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Carroll L. Beedy, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oliver Senti, It is ordered that Ralph T. Finley, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Ellis Moore, It is ordered that Francis Seiberling, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick P. Lee, It is ordered that Simon H. Rifkind, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. S. Broussard, It is ordered that John H. Tucker, Jr., Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. S. Broussard, It is ordered that Thomas M. Milling, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that Francis P. Whitehair, Esquire, of DeLand, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Deneen, It is ordered that Howard P. Castle, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Waterman, It is ordered that Frank N. Bancroft, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Waterman, It is ordered that Sam R. Owens, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Charles H. Blatchford, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

James Howard Snook,		On petition for writ of certiorari
	Petitioner,	to the Supreme Court of the
689 vs.		State of Ohio.
The State of Ohio.		

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. L. Crawford, in his individual capacity, etc., Appellant, 499 vs. Superior Court of the State of California, et al.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Casper A. Ornbaun for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.
John Patton, Harold Conant, et al., 53 vs. The United States of America.	This case was argued by Mr. Claude Rowlin for John Patton, et al., and by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the United States.
The Aluminum Castings Company, Petitioner, 198 vs. Carl F. Routzahn, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue.	This case was argued by Mr. John T. Scott for the petitioner, and by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.
New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner, 212 vs. Donato Marcone, as Administrator, etc.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William H. Carey for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Stewart Lee, It is ordered that Warren Cubbon Lee, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Margaret T. Lynch, It is ordered that Sol Selb, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy St. Louis, It is ordered that Barritt Galloway, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newton D. Baker, It is ordered that Frederick W. Green, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis Seiberling, It is ordered that George R. Hargreaves, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, it is ordered that Jerome Alper, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis Seiberling, It is ordered that William A. Spencer, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis Seiberling, It is ordered that Donovan D. Isham, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mark W. Maclay, Jr., It is ordered that Ralph Wolcott Brown, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence J. McLeod, It is ordered that Justin M. Hannick, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis Seiberling, It is ordered that Chester L. Dinsmore, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Sloan, It is ordered that Seymour L. Smith, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
212 vs.
Donato Marcone, as Administrator, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. William H. Carey for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. A. Owsley Stanley for the respondent.

State of Missouri at the relation of Missouri Insurance Company,
Appellant,
222 vs.
Frederick Gehner, as Assessor, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Ralph T. Finley for the appellant, and by Mr. Oliver Senti for the appellee.

Thomas A. Early, Receiver of the Farmers & Merchants National Bank of Lake City,
Petitioner,
226 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George P. Barse for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. M. G. Wallace for the respondent.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1930 -

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence J. McLeod, It is ordered that Louis Tucker, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George J. Feldman, It is ordered that Herman L. Bush, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Driver, It is ordered that C. T. Carpenter, Esquire, of Marked Tree, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Willis C. Sears, It is ordered that C. A. Sorensen, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thomas A. Early, Receiver of the Farmers & Merchants National Bank of Lake City, Petitioner, 226 vs. Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. M. C. Wallace for the respondent and concluded by Mr. R. E. Whiting for the petitioner.
Home Insurance Company and Franklin Insurance Company, Appellants, 232 vs. C. J. Dick, et al.	This case was argued by Mr. David Rumsey and Mr. Mark W. Maclay for the appellants, and by Mr. H. C. Hughes and Mr. John Neethe for the appellees.
State of Ohio ex rel. E. H. Bryant, Appellant, 237 vs. Akron Metropolitan Park District for Summit County, et al.; State of Ohio ex rel. Pauline Wadsworth, Appellant, 238 vs. John A. Zangerle, Auditor of Cuyahoga County, et al.	Three hours allowed for oral argument on motion of Mr. Frederick A. Henry. The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Frederick A. Henry for the appellants.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Eckert, It is ordered that Theodore A. Kolb, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clyde R. Hoey, It is ordered that N. C. Harris, Esquire, of Rutherfordton, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newton D. Baker, It is ordered that Donald W. Kling, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, It is ordered that Harrison B. Martin, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clyde R. Hoey, It is ordered that Frederick D. Hamrick, Esquire, of Rutherfordton, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. L. Hamby, It is ordered that Lee W. Hagerman, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. U. Bon Geaslin, It is ordered that Benjamin H. Charles, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Waterman, It is ordered that Harold H. Healy, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

George Graham Rice, et al.,
Petitioners,
613 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion of Mr. Louis Titus, in that behalf, leave was granted petitioners to file a reply brief in this cause by Monday next.

State of Ohio ex rel. E. H. Bryant,
Appellant,
237 vs.
Akron Metropolitan Park District for Summit County, et al.;
State of Ohio ex rel. Pauline Wadsworth,
Appellant,
238 vs.
John A. Zangerle, Auditor of Cuyahoga County, et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Luther Day for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Victorio Nogueira, Petitioner, 248 vs. New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company.	This case was argued by Mr. Sol Gelb for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward R. Brumley for the respondent.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 250 vs. Ox Fibre Brush Company.	This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry B. Sutter for the respondent.
William Miller, Petitioner, 261 vs. H. J. McLaughlin, Secretary, etc.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Seymour L. Smith for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. C. A. Sorensen for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until M

MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John P. Bramhall, It is ordered that Charles Hervey Naylor, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick C. Dezendorf, It is ordered that Samuel Heavrin Breidenbach, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. J. Hughes, Jr., It is ordered that Arthur J. Gross, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Sternhagen, It is ordered that Harold F. Noneman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Sternhagen, It is ordered that Peter J. Mitchell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick C. Dazendorf, It is ordered that Oliver V. Emery, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. L. Herold, It is ordered that Leon C'Quin, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin S. Broussard, It is ordered that George Seth Guion, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. L. Herold, It is ordered that Henry Clay Walker, Jr., Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip Pitt Campbell, It is ordered that William Osmond, Esquire, of Great Bend, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Philip Pitt Campbell, It is ordered that William R. Smith, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Sisson, It is ordered that Laurel E. Anderson, Esquire, of Burlingame, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Norris, It is ordered that Clarence T. Spier, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Robert Fountain Higgins, Esquire, of Marlin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Ben H. Powell, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Magruder, It is ordered that James A. Cunningham, Esquire, of Booneville, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Amory Lee,, It is ordered that Milo J. Warner, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte:
Buenaventura Lopez, Petitioner.
—, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ex parte:
Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
21, Original.

On consideration of the returns of Charles N. Pray and George M. Bourquin, District Judges of the United States for the District of Montana, to the peremptory writ of mandamus heretofore issued in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said returns be, and they are hereby, accepted as showing that the writ of mandamus herein has been obeyed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
555 vs.
Alfred E. Norris.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted, and the cause is advanced and assigned for argument at the head of the call on Monday, April 14th next.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

S. O. Wynne, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.,
510 vs.
Swanson Chemical Corporation;
James M. Doran, Prohibition Commissioner, etc., et al.,
511 vs.
Martin H. Casper, Trading as Delmar Manufacturing and Chemical Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the causes assigned for argument on Monday, April 14, next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company,
Appellant,
680 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 14 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Emmett Cochran, W. M. Guice, Jr., Henry Steinau, et al.,
Appellants,
468 vs.
Louisiana State Board of Education, et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that further consideration of the motion to dismiss this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on its merits. The case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, April 14 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Rebecca Grant,

Appellant,

663 vs.

Glynn Canning Company and Maryland Casualty Company.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Rebecca Grant,

Appellant,

663 vs.

Glynn Canning Company and Maryland Casualty Company.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Rebecca Grant,

Appellant,

663 vs.

Glynn Canning Company and Maryland Casualty Company.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. L. Morgan, Appellant, vs. The State of Georgia. 235 — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Clarence L. Johnson, A. P. Bonner, L. A. Vaughan, et al., Appellants, vs. State Highway Commission of South Carolina, John G. Richards, Governor, et al. 538 — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Clarence L. Johnson, A. P. Bonner, L. A. Vaughan, et al., Appellants, vs. State Highway Commission of South Carolina, John G. Richards, Governor, et al. 538 — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. L. Crawford, In His Individual Capacity
and on Behalf of Other Protesting
Taxpayers,
Appellant,
vs.
Superior Court of the State of California
in and for the County of Mendocino, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

499

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. L. Crawford, In His Individual Capacity
and on Behalf of Other Protesting
Taxpayers,
Appellant,
vs.
Superior Court of the State of California
in and for the County of Mendocino, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

499

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of California as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Albert Turner,
Appellant,
vs.
W. P. Winters.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

484

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Albert Turner,

Appellant,

484 vs.

W. P. Winters.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles H. Stange,

Petitioner,

554 vs.

The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted, with the limitation, however, that counsel shall confine themselves, in the briefs and in oral argument, to the questions involving the validity and effect of the waiver of the statute of limitations executed in this cause.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

579 vs.

Sanford & Brooks Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fouth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Anna Uravic, as Administratrix of the Goods, Chattels and Credits which were of Anton Uravic, deceased,

Petitioner,

581 vs.

F. Jarka Company, Inc. and United American Line, Inc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

R. E. Graham and E. E. Foster, co-partners, doing business under the firm name of Millie Francis Oil Company, a co-partnership,

Petitioners,

589 vs.

Rex B. Goodcell, Former Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States of America, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert Carnahan,

Petitioner,

551 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles Stockton,

Petitioner,

558 vs.

L. C. Massey (D. H. Stephenson),
Sheriff of Kanawha County.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Maurice Sugarman and Jud Purdue,

Petitioners,

560 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Herbert Goudchaux,

Petitioner,

561 vs.

M. A. Joy, Receiver.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Michele Piccolella,

Petitioner,

562 vs.

Commissioner of Immigration,
Ellis Island, New York Harbor.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James H. Hooper,

Petitioner,

565 vs.

Philip Goldstein.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

566 vs.

Nellie Reardon, General Administratrix of the Estate of Joseph A. Smith, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Continental National Bank,

Petitioner,

567 vs.

Holland Banking Company, a corporation in course of liquidation by S. L. Cantley, Commissioner of Finance.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Receivers of Gulf States Oil & Refining Corporation,

Petitioner,

568 vs.

Island Oil and Transport Corporation, Island Oil Marketing Corporation and Arthur J. Stevens, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Royal Indemnity Company of New York, The Fidelity & Casualty Company of New York, et al.,

Petitioners,

571 vs.

L. A. Andrew, Superintendent of Banking of the State of Iowa, as Receiver of the Crawford County State Bank of Denison, Iowa.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the SupremeCourt of the State of Iowa.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Surety Company of New York,
Petitioner,
572 vs.
Henry Mullendore, Receiver.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George A. Moffett and Benjamin Miport,
Petitioners,
575 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jess M. Caldwell,
Petitioner,
576 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jess M. Caldwell,

Petitioner,

577 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert A. Uihlein,

Petitioner,

578 vs.

City of St. Paul, a Municipal Corporation, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Phoenix Building and Homestead Association,

Petitioner,

580 vs.

E. A. Carrere's Sons.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cincinnati, New Orleans and Texas Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Mary A. McGill, as Administratrix of the Estate of W. I. McGill, deceased. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Tennessee.

582

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Aldine Realty Company of Pittsburgh, Petitioner, vs. Manor Real Estate and Trust Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

585

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Titus A. Haffa, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

587

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alabama Chemical Company,
Petitioner,
588 vs.
International Agricultural Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Minnie Rishel,
Petitioner,
707 vs.
The County of McPherson, Kansas, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward Eliason and Elin Eliason,
Appellants,
347 vs.
Charles Wilborn, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file brief of Clayton F. Smith, Registrar of Titles, of Cook County, Illinois, as amicus curiae, and for leave to make oral argument on the merits of the case,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the motion with respect to the filing of brief as amicus curiae, be, and the same is hereby, granted, provided service has been made and notice given to the parties. The motion of Clayton F. Smith, Registrar of Titles, etc., to present oral argument is denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward Eliason and Elin Eliason,
Appellants,
347 vs.
Charles Wilborn, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file brief of the Cook County Real Estate Board of Chicago as amicus curiae and to appear and present oral argument,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ex parte:
Hugo De Watteville Senitha, Petitioner,
—, Original.

The motion for leave to file a petition for reconsideration of the motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugo De Watteville Senitha, pro se.

William Brace,
Petitioner,
630 vs.
Gauger-Korsmo Construction Company, et al.;
Fidelity Bond and Mortgage Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
631 vs.
Gauger-Korsmo Construction Company, et al.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Claude Duty, leave was granted to file a brief of the State of Arkansas, as amicus curiae, in these causes. Service of brief to be made and counsel for respondent granted leave to file a reply within 20 days.

Ex parte: H. D. Smith and J. V. Smith,
—, Original. Petitioners,

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Calhoun in behalf of counsel for the petitioners.

Charles Jackson,
Petitioner,
463 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Milo J. Warner as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Paul Bernard Wiss, a minor, by his guardian ad litem, Jos. Van Heemissen,
Appellant,,
536 vs.
Booth Fisheries Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the appellant in this cause have failed to file the statement as to jurisdiction as required by the Rules of this Court;

Therefore, in pursuance of the Twelfth Rule of this Court, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph Wall, et al.,
Appellants,
557 vs.
Bankers Life Company of Des Moines, Iowa.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard L. Bump, Mr. Louis H. Salinger, Mr. J. M. Parsons, and Mr. Clarence I. Spencer for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. Charles S. Bradshaw and Mr. Raymond B. Alberson for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Mead-Morrison Manufacturing Company,
Appellant,
570 vs.
Russell B. Marchant, as Trustee, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. McClennen and Mr. Arthur P. French for the appellant, and by Mr. Kenneth M. Spence for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Harold J. Coolidge and Augustus P. Loring, Trustees,
Appellants,
583 vs.
Henry F. Long, Commissioner, etc.;
Harold J. Coolidge and Augustus P. Loring, Trustees,
Appellants,
584 vs.
Henry F. Long, Commissioner, etc.

The statements as to jurisdiction in these causes, were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert C.Dodge for the appellants.

The Rex Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
604 vs.
Wenatchee Rex Spray Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis C. Downey and Mr. Fred L. Chappell for the petitioners, and by Mr. John H. Miller, Mr. A. W. Boykin, and Mr. Alfred Gfeller for the respondents.

F. M. Hatch, et al.,
Petitioners,
614 vs.
The United States of America;
Frank M. Hatch, et al.,
Petitioners,
615 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. M. Brackney for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Barham R. Gary for the respondent.

Axel Langnes, Owner, etc.,
Petitioner,
617 vs.
Winfield A. Green, Claimant.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira Bronson and Mr. H. B. Jones for the petitioner.

The United States of America, on the relation of Shults Bread Company,
Petitioner,
620 vs.
Board of Tax Appeals.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Sullivan and Mr. Leon F. Cooper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Morton K. Rothschild, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Charles T. Hendler for the respondent.

Valentine Becker,
Petitioner,
621 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Max V. Schoonmaker and Mr. Joseph A. Rossi for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Vincent E. Barnes and Ellen L. Barnes,
Petitioners,
624 vs.
City of Springfield.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court in and for the County of Hampden, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis C. Henin for the petitioners, and by Mr. John P. Kirby for the respondent.

M. Samuel & Sons, Incorporated,
Petitioner,
626 vs.
The Second National Bank of Toledo.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morris D. Kopple for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert C. Morris for the respondent.

Earl M. Wilcox,
Petitioner,
629 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. A. Boone for the petitioner.

William Brace,
Petitioner,
630 vs.
Gauger-Korsmo Construction Company, et al.;
Fidelity Bond and Mortgage Company, et al., Petitioners,
631 vs.
Gauger-Korsmo Construction Company, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Love Hopkins for the petitioners, and by Mr. Will G. Akers and Mr. A. Longstreet Heiskell for the respondents.

Norman W. Church,
Petitioner,
635 vs.
George S. Harnit, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. T. Kinder and Mr. John B. McMahon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lloyd T. Williams for the respondents.

The Merard Holding Company, Inc. Petitioner,
644 vs.
Margaret Cook Fitzgerald.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of Connecticut was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Harvey Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Homer Cummings and Mr. Charles D. Lockwood for the respondent.

Madeline Padgett, Petitioner,
654 vs.
District of Columbia;
Edna Ellis Hilton, Petitioner,
655 vs.
District of Columbia;
Edith W. Ely, Petitioner,
656 vs.
District of Columbia;
Flora G. Steinberg, Petitioner,
657 vs.
District of Columbia;
Marian A. Newman, Petitioner,
658 vs.
District of Columbia;
Laskey W. Johnson, Petitioner,
659 vs.
District of Columbia;
Evva M. Herron, Petitioner,
660 vs.
District of Columbia.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul E. Leah, Mr. Stanton C. Peelle, Mr. C. F. H. Ogilby, Mr. Dale D. Drain, and Mr. Jerome F. Barnard for the petitioners, and by Mr. William W. Bride and Mr. F. H. Stephens for the respondent.

John Hinkley and Fidelity Trust Company of Baltimore, Trustees, etc. / Petitioners,
692 vs.
The Art Students League of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick J. Singley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles McH. Howard for the respondent.

William Miller, Petitioner, vs. H. J. McLaughlin, Secretary of the Department of Agriculture for the State of Nebraska, et al.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. C. A. Sorensen for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. A. Henry Walter for the petitioner.
261	
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Guy C. Earl.	This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Warren Olney, Jr., for the respondent.
99	
Commonwealth of Kentucky, Complainant, vs. State of Indiana, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Clifford B. Smith for the complainant.
16, Original.	

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter C. Clephane, It is ordered that William C. Van Vleck, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Humphrey, It is ordered that Howard D. Moses, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Richard S. Flaherty, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Kehoe, It is ordered that Jacob H. Berman, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky, Complainant, 16, Original. vs. The State of Indiana, et al.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Clifford E. Smith for the complainant, and concluded by Mr. Thomas P. Littlepage for James Duane Duncan, et al., individual defendants.
The Ohio Oil Company, Appellant, 440 vs. E. A. Conway, Supervisor of Public Accounts of the State of Louisiana.	This case was argued by Mr. Sidney L. Herold for the appellant, and by Mr. W. H. Thompson and Mr. George S. Guion for the appellees.
The United States of America, 548 vs. Mattie Puckett Worley, Administratrix, etc.; Charles Jackson, Petitioner, 463 vs. The United States of America.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Thomas Amory Lee for the petitioner in No. 463; continued by Mr. L. T. Spier for Worley, Administratrix, in No. 548; and by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Symons, It is ordered that Roy F. Steward, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, It is ordered that Joshua C. Taylor, Esquire, of Chester, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin W. Fort, It is ordered that Guy George Gabrielson, Esquire, of East Orange, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adolph Kanneberg, It is ordered that Suel O. Arnold, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Franc-Strohmenger & Cowan, Inc., Petitioner,
305 vs.
Baro Forchheimer, Doing Business under the name and style of B. Forchheimer & Co., et al.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel to continue this cause until the next term of Court has been filed;
Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, continued until the next term of Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
548 vs.
Mattie Puckett Worley, Administratrix, etc.;
Charles Jackson, Petitioner,
463 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of these cases was concluded by Mr. Clarence T. Spier for Worley, Administratrix, in No. 548.

Robert G. Meadows, Petitioner,
269 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles Kerr for the petitioner, and by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

The Henrietta Mills, Petitioner,
270 vs.
Rutherford County, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Willis Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clyde R. Hoey for the respondent.

Memphis & Charleston Railway Company, Appellant,
276 vs.
C. L. Pace, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. John D. Hyde for the appellant, and by Mr. W. W. Magruder and Mr. B. H. Charles for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick H. Wood, It is ordered that Jeremiah F. Connor, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that Oscar Ross Ewing, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph E. Day, It is ordered that Frederick J. Schmitt, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph E. Day, It is ordered that Ira Chase Kochne, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George J. Feldman, It is ordered that Eugene C. McCabe, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James L. Fly, It is ordered that Godfrey von Hofe, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Farrar, It is ordered that Charles A. Chandler, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Walter A. May, Herbert L. May, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
311 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Ward Loveless, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
281 vs.
D. D. Adams;
The United States of America,
Appellant,
282 vs.
D. D. Adams.

These cases were argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Sisson for the appellant, and by Mr. T. H. Caraway for the appellee.

Quapaw Land Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
300 vs.
S. H. Bolinger.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Sidney L. Herold for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1930 - CONTINUED

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, et al., etc., Appellants, vs. W. G. Maxcy, as Receiver, etc.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Suel O. Arnold for the appellants and continued by Mr. Adolph Kanneberg for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.
301	
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co., Petitioner, vs. Mabel G. Toops, Administratrix, etc.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William Osmond for the petitioner.
303	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Edward T. Sanford,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer R. Mendricks, It is ordered that George M. Wolcott, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Raymond A. Latting, Esquire, of Grand Ledge, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hubert F. Fisher, It is ordered that Royden Dixon, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer R. Mendricks, it is ordered that John C. Mistine, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 1930

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin C. Dutton, It is ordered that George D. Barroughs, Esquire, of Edwardsville, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co., Petitioner,
303 vs.
Mabel C. Toops, Administratrix, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. William Osmond for the petitioner, by Mr. Carr M. Taylor for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. William R. Smith for the petitioner.

Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company, Appellant,
307 vs.
Phoenix Indemnity Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Exchange Drug Company, Appellant,
309 vs.
Henry S. Long, as Chairman of the State Tax Commission of Alabama, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. R. B. Evins for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Walter A. May, Herbert L. May, et al., Petitioners,
311 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles H. Sachs for the petitioners, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.

Miles Bement Pond Company, Petitioner,
314 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Karl D. Loos for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justices.
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

Mr. Justice Holmes said:

"On Saturday, just as we were expecting him at a conference of the Justices, we were informed that our brother, Mr. Justice Sanford, had become unconscious pending a slight operation. Five minutes later we received word that he was dead. Thus suddenly the light of a faithful worker who was born also to charm went out. Afterwards came the news that the late Chief Justice had found relief from his hopeless illness in death. Such events must be accepted in silent awe.

"A committee of the Court, consisting of the Chief Justice, Mr. Justice McReynolds, Mr. Justice Butler, and Mr. Justice Stone, has gone to Tennessee for the services over the late Mr. Justice Sanford, and on Tuesday the whole Court will attend the funeral of Mr. Taft.

"In pursuance of the statute the Court will stand adjourned until to-morrow, when it will be adjourned again until Wednesday next at 12 o'clock, when the matters then in order will be taken up."

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.

Proclamation being made the Court adjourned until

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.

Oliver Wendell Holmes,

Willis Van Devanter,

James C. McReynolds,

Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.

George Sutherland,

Pierce Butler,

Harlan F. Stone.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Hull, It is ordered that Loyola M. Coyne, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilber M. Brucker, It is ordered that Elijah B. Howarth, Esquire, of Royal Oak, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilber M. Brucker, It is ordered that Kit F. Clardy, Esquire, of Lansing, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Edward J. O'Mara, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. Brantley, It is ordered that John A. Hynds, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that Walter A. Harris, Esquire, of Macon, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. A. Youngquist, It is ordered that Henry N. Benson, Esquire, of St. Peter, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, It is ordered that Wellington D. Rankin, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Barbour, It is ordered that Elam I. Feemster, Esquire, of Visalia, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Edward J. Gunning,		On writ of certiorari to the
	Petitioner,	Court of Appeals of the
31	vs.	District of Columbia.
Gertrude L. Cooley.		

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Thomas A. Early, Receiver of the
Farmers & Merchants National Bank
of Lake City,
Petitioner,
226 vs.
Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

State of Ohio ex rel. E. H. Bryant,
Appellant,
237 vs.
Akron Metropolitan Park District for
Summit County, F. A. Seiberling, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State of Ohio ex rel. Pauline Wadsworth,
Appellant,
238 vs.
John A. Zangerle, Auditor of Cuyahoga
County; the Board of Park Commissioners of
the Metropolitan Park District of Cleveland,
Harry M. Farnsworth, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin,
Lewis E. Gettle, Adolph Kanneberg,
et al., etc., Appellants,

vs.

W. G. Maxcy, as Receiver of the
Washburn Water Works and Washburn
Water Works Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, set aside with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin, specially constituted as provided by the statute, to state its findings of fact and conclusions of law and enter a decree thereon, the restraining order entered in the suit to be continued pending further action by the said District Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Ex parte:
H. D. Smith and J. V. Smith,
—, Original. Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

S. O. Wynne, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner,
510 vs.
Swanson Chemical Corporation;
James M. Doran, Prohibition Commissioner of the United States, et al.,
Petitioners,
511 vs.
Martin H. Casper.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases, heretofore assigned for Monday, April 14th next, be, and they are hereby, reassigned for hearing with Nos. 443, 444, and 445 as one case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Quapaw Land Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
300 vs.
S. H. Bolinger.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, set aside; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana with directions to dismiss the petition for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Exchange Drug Company,

Appellant,

309 vs.

Henry S. Long, as Chairman of the State Tax Commission of Alabama, and John S. Tilley, et al., etc.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph Wall, Charles Gramm, et al.,

Appellants,

557 vs.

Bankers Life Company, of Des Moines, Iowa.

It is now here ordered that further consideration of the question of jurisdiction of this Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mead-Morrison Manufacturing Company,

Appellant,

570 vs.

Russell B. Marchant, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Bear Tractors, Inc.

It is now here ordered that further consideration of the question of jurisdiction of this Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harold J. Coolidge and Augustus P. Loring, Trustees,

Appellants,

583 vs.

Henry F. Long, Commissioner, etc.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this cause, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harold J. Coolidge and Augustus P. Loring, Trustees,

Appellants,

584 vs.

Henry F. Long, Commissioner, etc.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this cause, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louis H. Ensten and Lion Knitting Mills Company,

Petitioners,

650 vs.

Simon Ascher & Company, Incorporated.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Axel Langnes, Owner of the Diesel Halibut Vessel "Aloha" her engines, etc.,

Petitioner,

617 vs.

Winfield A. Green, Claimant.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

592 vs.

State of Florida, ex rel. Fred H. Davis, as Attorney General, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henderson County, State of Kentucky,

Petitioner,

593 vs.

State Bank of New York and George A. Eyer, doing business under the name of Eyer & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henderson County, State of Kentucky,

Petitioner,

594 vs.

State Bank of New York and George A. Eyer, doing business under the name of Eyer & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henderson County, State of Kentucky,

Petitioner,

595 vs.

State Bank of New York and George A. Eyer, doing business under the name of Eyer & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henderson County, State of Kentucky,

Petitioner,

596 vs.

State Bank of New York and George A. Eyer, doing business under the name of Eyer & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

599 vs.

Mrs. Effie R. Bushey, Administratrix of the Estate of George M. Bushey, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cheney Brothers,

Petitioner,

601 vs.

Doris Silk Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George A. Gaston and J. W. Redmond,
as Receivers of Central Vermont
Railway Company,

Petitioners,

602 vs.

Rutland Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

S. L. Miller, A. J. Biddison, Harry
Campbell, et al., etc.,

Petitioners,

603 vs.

Annie Take, now Toy, Louisa Take,
et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul &
Pacific Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

606 vs.

Wilfred Garedpy, a minor, appearing by
L. Meisenhelder, his Guardian ad litem.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert W. Bingham, Petitioner,
608 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

S. Homer Federman, Petitioner,
609 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

City of New York, Petitioner,
612 vs.
Federal Radio Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George Graham Rice, Idaho Copper Corporation, Wall Street Iconoclast, Inc., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 613

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Samuel D. Leidesdorf, as trustee in Bankruptcy of Universal Pile Fabric Coat House, Inc., Bankrupt, Petitioner, vs. Union Indemnity Company. 616

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

McCord Radiator & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, vs. Geza Horvath. 619

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Auglaize Box Board Company,
Petitioner,
638 vs.
The Kansas City Fibre Box Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Rex Company, The Toledo Rex Spray Company, California Rex Spray Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
604 vs.
Wenatchee Rex Spray Company, Yakima Rex Spray Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

F. M. Hatch, H. U. Carpenter and James Volin,
Petitioners,
614 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank M. Hatch, Hiram U. Carpenter and James F. Volin, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

615 On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, on the relation of Shults Bread Company, a body corporate, Petitioner, vs. Board of Tax Appeals,

620 On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Valentine Becker, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

621 On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Vincent E. Barnes and Ellen L. Barnes, Petitioners,
624 vs.
City of Springfield.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court in and for the County of Hampden, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court in and for the County of Hampden, State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

M. Samuel & Sons, Incorporated, Petitioner,
626 vs.
The Second National Bank of Toledo.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Earl M. Wilcox, Petitioner,
629 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Norman W. Church,

Petitioner,

635 vs.

George S. Harmit, Henry H. Hewitt, William A. Hein, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Merard Holding Company, Incorporated,

Petitioner,

644 vs.

Margaret Cook Fitzgerald.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of Connecticut.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of Connecticut, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Madeline Padgett,

Petitioner,

654 vs.

District of Columbia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edna Ellis Hilton, Petitioner, vs. District of Columbia.

655

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edith W. Ely, Petitioner, vs. District of Columbia.

656

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Flora G. Steinberg, Petitioner, vs. District of Columbia.

657

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Marian A. Newman, Petitioner,
658 vs.
District of Columbia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Laskey W. Johnson, Petitioner,
659 vs.
District of Columbia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Evva M. Herron, Petitioner,
660 vs.
District of Columbia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John Hinkley and Fidelity Trust Company
of Baltimore, Trustees under the Will
of Edward G. McDowell, deceased, etc., Petitioners,
vs.
The Art Students League of New York.

692

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice also announced the following orders:

ORDER OF ALLOTMENT OF JUSTICES.

There having been a Chief Justice of this Court appointed since the order of allotment of Justices entered April 10, 1929,

It is ordered, That the present allotment of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of this Court among the circuits, agreeably to the act of Congress in such case made and provided, be altered by making the following allotment, which shall be entered of record, viz:

For the Fourth Circuit, Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.

ORDER.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, March 17, until Monday, April 14 next.

Skinner and Eddy Corporation,
Petitioner,
605 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for respondent in this cause to defer the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari and for leave to file brief on or before March 24th next,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Fruit Growers, Inc.,
Petitioner,
667 vs.
Brogdex Company.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, leave was granted to file a brief of the United States as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Edward Eliason and Elin Eliason,
Appellants,
347 vs.
Charles Wilborn, et al.

The motion of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws for leave to appear and join in briefs as amicus curiae herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan William MacChesney in that behalf.

Edward Eliason and Elin Eliason,
Appellants,
347 vs.
Charles Wilborn, et al.

The motion of the National Association of Real Estate Boards for leave to appear and join in briefs as amicus curiae herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan William MacChesney in that behalf.

American Fruit Growers, Inc.,
Petitioner,
667 vs.
Brogdex Company.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Melville Church, leave was granted to file reply of respondent to briefs amici curiae, in this cause.

American Fruit Growers, Inc.,
Petitioner,
667 vs.
Brogdex Company.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Barry Mohun, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Florida as amicus curiae, in this cause.

American Fruit Growers, Inc.,
Petitioner,
667 vs.
Brogdex Company.

The motion for leave to file brief of the Florida Citrus Growers Clearing House Association as amicus curiae, in this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Barry Mohun, and the motion was denied.

American Fruit Growers, Inc.,
Petitioner,
667 vs.
Brogdex Company.

The motion for leave to file brief of the International Apple Association as amicus curiae, in this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James P. Burns, and the motion was denied.

The City of Cincinnati,
Petitioner,
372 vs.
Margaret W. Vester;
The City of Cincinnati,
Petitioner,
373 vs.
James S. Richards, et al.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Hamilton Ward, leave was granted to file brief of the State of New York as amicus curiae, in these causes.

The Live Stock National Bank,
Petitioner,
652 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to defer the submission of the petition for certiorari in this cause for 60 days, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. Du Pratt, Franklin W. Hopkins, Edward J. Partridge, et al.,
Appellants,
336 vs.
Sparkill Realty Corporation and Standard Trap Rock Corporation.

On consideration of the motion for the issuance of the mandate forthwith in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward B. Weston, et al.,
Appellants,
574 vs.
Beaver-Remmers-Graham Company, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wellmore B. Turner for the appellants.

Mack C. Davis,
Appellant,
590 vs.
Theodore Dewitt Teague.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mack C. Davis, pro se.

St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
610 vs.
C. F. Teague.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Z. Mahaffey, Mr. J. R. Turney, and Mr. John J. King for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wright Patman for the respondent.

The Butler Hotel Co., Inc., et al.,
Petitioners,
618 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur E. Griffin and Mr. Samuel B. Bassett for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Herbert Pearson, Receiver of the Fourth National Bank of Macon, Georgia,
Petitioner,
622 vs.
Farmers National Bank of Monticello, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Jones ~~Mr. A. O. Bacon Sparks~~ for the petitioner, and by Mr. Orville A. Park for the respondents.

Leslie T. Alward,
Petitioner,
628 vs.
C. C. Johnson, Treasurer of the State of California.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Burke Corbet for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
632 vs.
Boston Buick Company;
The United States of America,
Petitioner,
633 vs.
Iron Cap Copper Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, Miss Helen Carloss, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. R. E. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert N. Miller for the respondent in No. 632 and by Mr. Burton E. Eames for the respondent in No. 633.

Henry R. Tyroler, Rena Rae Tyroler, et al.,
Petitioners,
634 vs.
Carl F. Routzahn, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leon F. Cooper and Mr. M. S. Farmer for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John Vaughan Groner, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Board of County Commissioners of the County of Weld,
Petitioner,
639 vs.
Union Pacific Railroad Company;
Board of County Commissioners of the County of Prowers,
Petitioner,
640 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William B. Kelly and Mr. Charles Roach for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clayton C. Dorsey, Mr. Nelson H. Loomis, Mr. Gerald Hughes, Mr. W. W. Grant, Jr., Mr. Morrison Shafroth, and Mr. E. E. McInnis for the respondents.

The Austin Company,
Petitioner,
641 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. B. Stewart and Mr. G. M. Horn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Saint Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
645 vs.
State of Arkansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas B. Pryor, Mr. Edward T. Miller, Mr. Edward L. Westbrooke, and Mr. Edward J. White for the petitioners, and by Mr. Hal L. Norwood, Mr. Frank Pace, and Mr. Tom W. Campbell for the respondent.

Mickey Meyers, Petitioner,
646 vs.
The United States of America;
Gus Meyers, Petitioner,
647 vs.
The United States of America;
Sam Meyers, Petitioner,
648 vs.
The United States of America;
James Swift, Petitioner,
649 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur F. Schmidt for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

The Kant-Skore Piston Company, etc. Petitioner,
651 vs.
Sinclair Manufacturing Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Symons, Mr. Leonard Garver, Jr., and Mr. David Lorbach for the petitioner.

Paul P. Scott, Petitioner,
653 vs.
Frank Corn.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 2d Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sam R. Sayers for the petitioner.

United States of America ex rel. Joseph Berencz, etc. Petitioner,	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. Palmer Ingram for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondents.
661 vs. Harry C. Martin, Warden of the Baltimore City Jail; Joseph Berencz, etc. Petitioner,	
662 vs. The United States of America.	
Fullerton Lumber Company, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stanley S. Gillam for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. W. Root, Mr. A. C. Erdall, and Mr. O. W. Dynes for the respondent.
664 vs. Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Company.	
Board of County Commissioners of the County of Garvin, etc., Petitioners,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cicero I. Murray for the petitioners.
666 vs. A. B. Dennis, T. J. Stewart, et al.	
American Fruit Growers, Inc., Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. T. M. McCready for the petitioner, and by Mr. Melville Church, Mr. Charles Neave, and Mr. Roy F. Steward for the respondent.
667 vs. Brogdex Company.	

Edward G. Spencer,
Petitioner,
668 vs.
Chicago and North Western Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard J. Finn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ray H. Van Doren and Mr. Samuel H. Cady for the respondent.

American Can Company,
Petitioner,
676 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.;
Missouri Can Company,
Petitioner,
677 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.;
American Can Company of Massachusetts,
Petitioner,
678 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.;
American Can Company of Utah,
Petitioner,
679 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Graham Sumner for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

The Maytag Company,
Petitioner,
687 vs.
The Meadows Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wallace R. Lane, Mr. Edward S. Rogers, and Mr. William J. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hal M. Stone for the respondent.

The United States, Petitioner, 700 vs. Swift and Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. Carroll Todd for the respondent.
Orenstein and Koppel Aktiengesellschaft, Petitioner, 717 vs. Koppel Industrial Car and Equipment Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dean Hill Stanley, Mr. Arthur Garfield Hays, and Mr. Wm. Cattron Rigby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, Mr. John A. Kratz, and Mr. Godfrey L. Munter for the respondent.
Niles Bement Pond Company, Petitioner, 314 vs. The United States.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Karl D. Loos for the petitioner, by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Karl D. Loos for the petitioner.
The United States of America, Appellant, 509 vs. Francisco Unzeuta.	This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the appellant, and was submitted by Mr. Allen G. Fisher for the appellee.

The State of Wisconsin, et al.,
Complainants,
7, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois, et al.;
The State of Michigan, et al.,
Complainants,
11, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois, et al.
The State of New York, et al.,
Complainants,
12, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois, et al.

Five hours were allowed for the oral argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the defendant, the Sanitary District of Chicago, and continued by Mr. Raymond T. Jackson for the complainant, the State of Wisconsin.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh C. Bickford, It is ordered that Maurice Fourcade, Jr., Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Armwell L. Cooper, It is ordered that John P. Cooper, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newton D. Baker, It is ordered that Charles E. Frohman, Esquire, of Sandusky, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Watkins, It is ordered that A. F. Gardner, Esquire, of Greenwood, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Clay Carpenter, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh C. Bickford, It is ordered that Frederick C. Roth, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee S. Overman, It is ordered that J. Y. E. Allen, Esquire, of Roxboro, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. William Tyler Page, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, presented the following resolutions:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

March 10, 1930.

The House having learned with profound sensibility and sorrow of the death of William Howard Taft, former President of the United States and Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court:

Resolved, That as a token of honor to the many virtues, public and private, of the illustrious statesman, and as a mark of respect to one who has held such eminent public station, the Speaker of this House shall appoint a committee to attend the funeral of Mr. Taft on behalf of the House.

Resolved, That such committee may join such committee as may be appointed on the part of the Senate to consider and report by what further token of respect and affection it may be proper for the Congress of the United States to express the deep sensibility of the Nation.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and to the Supreme Court and transmit a copy of the same to the afflicted family of the illustrious dead.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late William Howard Taft and the late Edward Terry Sanford this House do now adjourn until Wednesday, March 12, 1930.

Attest:

(S E A L) Wm. Tyler Page, Clerk.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.

March 10, 1930.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Edward Terry Sanford, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and to the Supreme Court and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Attest:

(S E A L) Wm. Tyler Page, Clerk.

The Chief Justice said:

"The resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives and presented by the Clerk of the House are received, and it is ordered that they be spread upon the records of the Court."

State of Wisconsin, et al.,
Complainants,
7, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois, et al.;
State of Michigan, et al.,
Complainants,
11, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois, et al.;
State of New York, et al.,
Complainants,
12, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois, et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Gilbert Bettman for the complainant, the State of Ohio; by Mr. Wilbur M. Brucker for the complainant, the State of Michigan; by Mr. Newton D. Baker for the complainants; by Mr. Edmond D. Adcock for the defendant, the Sanitary District of Chicago; and concluded by Mr. James M. Beck for the defendant, the Sanitary District of Chicago; and the case was submitted on printed brief by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the complainant, the State of New York.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
323 vs.
Kansas City Structural Steel Company;
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
324 vs.
Kansas City Structural Steel Company.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roscoe C. McCulloch, It is ordered that Sydney Lerner Geiger, Esquire, of Alliance, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, It is ordered that Robert F. Wagner, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Swager Sherley, It is ordered that Manton Davis, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. F. Snyder, It is ordered that DeWitt Clinton Edwards, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. O'Brien, It is ordered that John J. Mahoney, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America, Petitioner, 555 vs. Alfred E. Norris.	The motion to reassign this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 323 vs. Kansas City Structural Steel Company; Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 324 vs. Kansas City Structural Steel Company.	The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Armwell L. Cooper for the respondent.
Frank H. Dohany, Appellant, 338 vs. Frank F. Rogers, State Highway Commissioner of the State of Michigan, et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Frank H. Dohany, pro se, and by Mr. Kit F. Clardy and Mr. Wilbur F. Brucker for the appellees. Leave was granted the appellant to file reply brief within five days.
Columbus & Greenville Railway Company, Appellant, 339 vs. Mrs. Lorena S. Buford, et al.	This case was argued by Mr. William H. Watkins for the appellant, and the case was submitted by Mr. John Ambrose Tyson for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Burnita S. Matthews, It is ordered that Olive B. Lacy, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie C. Garnett, It is ordered that Edwin H. Brownley, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Granville Curry, It is ordered that Charles E. Boles, Esquire, of Glasgow, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Granville Curry, It is ordered that George M. Gardner, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. O'Neill, It is ordered that Harvey L. Lechner, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh Reid, It is ordered that George C. Yournas, Esquire, of Clarrendon, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Bennet, It is ordered that Augustus W. Bennet, Esquire, of Newburgh, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Seth W. Richardson, It is ordered that Edward P. Kelly, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. A. Youngquist, It is ordered that Harry Markson, Esquire, of Elmira, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugo L. Black, It is ordered that Thomas E. Knight, Jr., Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. Brantley, It is ordered that Morris Brandon, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon H. Rifkind, It is ordered that Barnett L. Hollander, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. A. Youngquist, It is ordered that Edward L. Boyle, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Guy C. Earl. 99 - On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes took no part in the consideration or decision of this Case.

The Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company,

Appellant,

307 vs.

Phoenix Indemnity Co.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Oklahoma,

Complainant,

6, Original. vs.

The State of Texas, defendant,

The United States of America, intervener.

On consideration of the report dated July 15, 1929, of Samuel S. Gannett, commissioner, heretofore designated to run, locate, and mark the boundary between the State of Oklahoma and the State of Texas along the true one hundredth meridian of longitude west from Greenwich as determined by the decree of January 3, 1927 (273 U. S. 83), modified by the decree of March 5, 1928 (276 U. S. 596), showing that he has run, located, and marked such boundary;

And no objection or exception to such report being presented, and the time therefor having expired;

It is now adjudged, ordered, and decreed as follows:

1. The said report is in all things confirmed.

2. The boundary line delineated and set forth in said report and on the accompanying maps is established and declared to be the true boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma along said meridian.

3. The clerk of this Court shall transmit to the chief magistrates of the States of Texas and Oklahoma and the Secretary of the Interior, copies of this decree, duly authenticated under the seal of this Court, together with copies of said report and of the accompanying maps.

4. As it appears that the said commissioner has completed his work conformably to said decrees, he is hereby discharged.

5. The clerk of this Court shall distribute and deliver to the chief magistrates of the States of Texas and Oklahoma and the Secretary of the Interior all copies of the said report made by the commissioner, with the accompanying maps, now in the clerk's hands, save that he shall retain 20 copies of each for purposes of certification and other needs that may arise in his office.

Decree announced by Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America, Petitioner,
555 vs.
Alfred E. Norris.

On consideration of the motion to reassign this case,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is set for argument on Monday, April 28th next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward Eliason and Elin Eliason, Appellants,
347. vs.
Charles Wilborn, et al.

On consideration of the motions of the National Conference of Commissioners on Union State Law and of the National Association of Real Estate Boards for leave to appear as amici curiae in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Powers-Kennedy Contracting Corporation, et al.,
Petitioners,
10 vs.
Concrete Mixing and Conveying Company;
Concrete Mixing and Conveying Company,
Petitioner,
11 vs.
R. C. Storrie & Company.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, restored to the docket for reargument.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Aluminum Castings Company,
Petitioner,
198 vs.
Carl F. Routzahn, Collector of Internal Revenue.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this case be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for reargument.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward B. Weston, et al.,
Appellants,
574 vs.
Beaver-Remmers-Graham Company, et al.

It is now here ordered by this Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mack C. Davis,
Appellant,
590 vs.
Theodore Dewitt Teague.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Columbus & Greenville Railway Company,

Appellant,

339 vs.

Mrs. Lorena S. Buford, in Her Own Behalf and as Next Friend of and for Lucile Buford, et al., Minors, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Leslie T. Alward,

Petitioner,

628 vs.

C. C. Johnson, Treasurer of the State of California.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

632 vs.

Boston Buick Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
633 vs.
Iron Cap Copper Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States,
Petitioner,
700 vs.
Swift and Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fullerton Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
664 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Fruit Growers, Inc., Petitioner,
667 vs.
Brogdex Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Orenstein and Koppel Aktiengesellschaft, Petitioner,
717 vs.
Koppel Industrial Car and Equipment Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company, Petitioner,
610 vs.
C. F. Teague.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Butler Hotel Co., Inc., John E. Savage, Marie Savage, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

618

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Herbert Pearson, Receiver of the Fourth National Bank of Macon, Georgia, Petitioner, vs. Farmers National Bank of Monticello, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

622

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry R. Tyroler, Rena Rae Tyroler, Rena C. Tyroler, et al., Petitioners, vs. Carl F. Routzahn, Collector of Internal Revenue. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

634

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Board of County Commissioners of the
County of Weld,

Petitioner,

639 vs.

Union Pacific Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Board of County Commissioners of the
County of Prowers,

Petitioner,

640 vs.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Austin Company,

Petitioner,

641 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Saint Louis-San Francisco Railway Company and Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,

Petitioners,

645 vs.

State of Arkansas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mickey Meyers,

Petitioner,

646 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gus Meyers,

Petitioner,

647 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sam Meyers,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

648

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James Swift,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

649

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Kant-Skore Piston Company, a Corporation under the laws of the State of Ohio,
Petitioner,
vs.
Sinclair Manufacturing Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

651

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Paul P. Scott,
Petitioner,
653 vs.
Frank Corn.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, 2nd Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 2nd Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America, ex rel. Joseph Derencz, otherwise known as Joseph G. Derencz,
Petitioner,
661 vs.
Harry C. Martin, Warden of the Baltimore City Jail.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph Derencz, otherwise known as Joseph G. Derencz,
Petitioner,
662 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Board of County Commissioners of the County of Garvin, State of Oklahoma, et al.,

Petitioners,

666 vs.

A. B. Dennis, T. J. Stewart and W. M. Longmire.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward G. Spencer,

Petitioner,

668 vs.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Can Company,

Petitioner,

676 vs.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the Second District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Missouri Can Company,

Petitioner,

677 vs.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the Second District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Can Company of Massachusetts,

Petitioner,

678 vs.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the Second District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Can Company of Utah,

Petitioner,

679 vs.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the Second District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Maytag Company,
Petitioner,
687 vs.
The Meadows Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Skinner and Eddy Corporation,
Petitioner,
605 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Greenfield Tap and Die Corporation,
Petitioner,
591 vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Henry Walter for the petitioner in support of the motion, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Percy M. Cox, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondents in opposition thereto.

Vermont Loan & Trust Company,
Appellant,
563 vs.
W. D. Gillis, as Attorney General of the State of Idaho.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file out of time the statement of points to be relied upon and designation of parts of record to be printed, and jurisdictional statement,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New World Life Insurance Company,
Appellant,
564 vs.
W. D. Gillis, as Attorney General of the State of Idaho.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file out of time the statement of points to be relied upon and designation of parts of record to be printed, and jurisdictional statement,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ex parte:
William T. Kemper, Petitioner,
---, Original.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Porter R. Chandler for the petitioner.

Edward Eliason and Elin Eliason,
Appellants,
347 vs.
Charles Wilborn, et al.

On consideration of the motion to pass and assign this case,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is assigned for argument on Monday, April 28th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Stanley Kestian and John Conrad,

Plaintiffs in Error,

607 vs.

The People of the State of Illinois.

In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the plaintiffs in error have failed to file the statement as to jurisdiction as required by the Rules of this Court;

Therefore, in pursuance of the Twelfth Rule of this Court, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company,

Appellant,

680 vs.

The United States of America, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. F. Taplin for the appellant.

The Greenfield Tap and Die Corporation,

Petitioner,

591 vs.

The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Henry Walter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Percy M. Cox, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

International Paper Company,

Petitioner,

698 vs.

The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Montgomery B. Angell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. George C. Butte for the respondent.

George W. Armstrong and Jno. H. Kirby, Petitioners,
671 vs.
City National Bank of Galveston, Texas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, First Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Armstrong and Mr. Jno. H. Kirby, pro se.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
672 vs.
Atlanta, Birmingham and Coast Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. R. C. Cocke, Mr. James F. Wright and Mr. Robert S. Parker for the petitioner, and by Mr. John A. Hynds for the respondent.

The Wisconsin Electric Company, Petitioner,
673 vs.
The Dumore Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Bayard Jones, Mr. Walter F. Murray, and Mr. Greer Marechal for the petitioner.

John F. Degener, Jr., et al., Petitioners,
682 vs.
Melville Boyd, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto C. Wierum for the petitioners, and by Mr. David W. Kahn for the respondent.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
683 vs.
Willingham Loan and Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Harvey R. Gamble, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. C. Murphy for the respondent.

The Early & Daniel Company, Petitioner,
685 vs.
Herbert Pearson, Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. O. B. Sparks and Mr. R. F. Brock for the petitioner, and by Mr. George S. Jones, for the respondent.

Meinrath Brokerage Company, Petitioner,
688 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester A. Gwinn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Barham R. Gary for the respondent.

Story Parchment Company, Petitioner,
704 vs.
The Paterson Parchment Paper Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward O. Proctor for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, April 14 next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. D. Jamieson, It is ordered that James U. Calloway, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney S. Alderman, It is ordered that Russell M. Robinson, Esquire, of Greensboro, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. H. Boyd, It is ordered that Glan Crawford, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew P. Martin, It is ordered that Charles F. Close, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Benton, It is ordered that Otto Book, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ray W. Nedrow, It is ordered that Alfred D. Raun, Esquire, of Walthill, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence J. McLeod, It is ordered that Constantine Thomas Dinu, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that Nathan R. Margold, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. A. Youngquist, It is ordered that Mr. Ulysses S. Grant, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that Marcial P. Lichauco, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. D. Jamieson, It is ordered that William Nash Johnson, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank L. Peckham, It is ordered that Nicholas S. Beckett, Esquire, of Lewisburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Eaton, It is ordered that Charles A. Prentice, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that Dorothy Ashby Monsure, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles M. Blackmar, It is ordered that P. T. Farnsworth, Jr., Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, It is ordered that C. Edward Paxson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Edelin, It is ordered that Henry Woog, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt, It is ordered that George M. LePine, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Ethel B. Burnside, of Washington, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Lois Gates Gorman, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Robert Eckels Burnside, Esquire, of Washington, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mrs. Mabel W. Willebrandt, It is ordered that Russell Z. Moninger, Esquire, of Washington, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Edelin, It is ordered that Benjamin A. Javits, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cordie Page, It is ordered that Edward W. Mullins, Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cordie Page, It is ordered that Irvine F. Belser, Esquire, of Columbia, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Wickersham, It is ordered that Henry S. Fraser, Esquire, of Syracuse, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
212 vs.
Donato Marcone, as Administrator of the Estate of Joseph Marcone, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company,
Petitioner,
303 vs.
Mabel G. Toops, Administratrix of the Estate of M. G. Toops, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Niles Bement Pond Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

314 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Frank H. Dohany,

Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of

338 vs. the United States for the Eastern

Frank F. Rogers, State Highway Com- District of Michigan.

missioner for the State of

Michigan, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

State of Missouri at the Relation of
Missouri Insurance Company,
Appellant,
222 vs.
Frederick Gehner, as Assessor of the City of St. Louis and as President of the Board of Equalization of the City of St. Louis, et al., etc.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes concurs on the ground that this case is governed by National Life Insurance Company vs. United States, 277 U. S. 508.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Stone in which Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur.

State of Missouri at the Relation of
Missouri Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
222 vs.
Frederick Gehner, as Assessor of the City of St. Louis and as President of the Board of Equalization of the City of St. Louis, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

National Fire Insurance Company of Hartford,

Appellant,

104 vs.

Joseph B. Thompson, Superintendent of the Insurance Department of the State of Missouri, and Stratton Shartel, Attorney General of the State of Missouri.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decree by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America,

548 vs.

Mattie Puckett Worley, Administratrix of the Estate of Emmet A. Puckett, Deceased, and Mattie Puckett Worley, Intervener.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that Question 1 need not be answered, and that Questions 2, 3 and 4 must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Charles Jackson, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 463

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

John Baizley Iron Works and The Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation, Limited, Appellants, vs. Abram Span. 62

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Stone in which Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur.

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Employers' Liability Assurance
Corporation, Ltd., of London, England, Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Myrtis Cook, et al.

81 On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Stone in which Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur.

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Walter A. May, Herbert L. May, Edwin C. May, et al., Executors of the Last Will and Testament of Pauline May, Deceased, Petitioners, vs. D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for 23rd District of Pennsylvania.

311 On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. The Pilliod Lumber Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

356

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Robert G. Meadows, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

269

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

John Patton, Harold Conant, and Jack Baker,

53 vs.

The United States of America.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Mr. Justice Sanford participated in the consideration and agreed to a disposition of the case in accordance with this opinion.

Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone concur in the result.

Alexander Sprunt & Son, Inc.; Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston Express Company, et al.,

Appellants,

19 vs.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, Arkansas Cotton Trade Association, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, so far as it concerns the appellants; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas with directions to dismiss the appellants' bill without costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

William Miller,

Petitioner,

261 vs.

H. J. McLaughlin, Secretary of the Department of Agriculture for the State of Nebraska, and Frank O'Connell, Chief Game Warden for the State of Nebraska.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

323 vs.

Kansas City Structural Steel Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
vs.
Kansas City Structural Steel Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

324

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the
Interior,
Petitioner,
vs.
United States of America ex rel. Mary I. Kadrie, Evelina Kadrie, Amit K. Kadrie, et al., etc.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

77

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and the judgment of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

State of Wisconsin, State of Minnesota, State of Ohio, and State of Pennsylvania, Complainants,

7, Original. vs.

State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, Defendants,

State of Missouri, State of Kentucky, State of Tennessee, State of Louisiana, State of Mississippi, and State of Arkansas, Intervening Defendants;

State of Michigan, Complainant,

11, Original. vs.

State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al., Defendants;

State of New York, Complainant,

12, Original. vs.

State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al., Defendants.

The opinion and decree were announced by Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes took no part in the consideration or decision of these cases.

United States of America, Appellant, vs. D. D. Adams. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

281

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged, by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

United States of America, Appellant, vs. D. D. Adams. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

282

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged, by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Ox Fibre Brush Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

250

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Henrietta Mills,

Petitioner,

270 vs.

Rutherford County, In the State of North Carolina, and W. C. Hardin, Sheriff.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs without prejudice to proceedings at law; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Victorio Nogueira,

Petitioner,

248 vs.

The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Francisco Unzeuta. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

509

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged, by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Ohio Oil Company, Appellant, vs. E. A. Conway, Supervisor of Public Accounts of the State of Louisiana. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

440

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,

Complainant,

16, Original. vs.

The State of Indiana, James Duane Duncan, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the pleadings and agreed statement of facts, and argument of counsel thereupon had;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint herein against the individual defendants in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

And it is further ordered that a decree for the complainant against the defendant State be entered. The complainant and the defendant State will be accorded twenty days within which to submit a form of decree to carry into effect the conclusions set forth in the opinion of the Court. Costs will be divided equally between the States.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company,

Appellant,

680 vs.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Memphis & Charleston Railway Company,

Appellant,

276 vs.

C. L. Pace, et al.

It is now ordered by this Court that this case be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for reargument.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

International Paper Company,
Petitioner,
598 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Wisconsin Electric Company,
Petitioner,
673 vs.
The Dumore Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
683 vs.
Willingham Loan and Trust Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Story Parchment Company,
Petitioner,
704 vs.
The Paterson Parchment Paper Company and Kalamazoo Vegetable Parchment Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Greenfield Tap and Die Corporation,
Petitioner,
591 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Greenfield Tap and Die Corporation,
Petitioner,
591 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this case to the Court of Claims for additional findings of fact,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George W. Armstrong and Jno. H. Kirby, Petitioners,
671 vs.
City National Bank of Galveston, Texas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, 1st Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 1st Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
672 vs.
Atlanta, Birmingham and Coast Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered bythis Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John F. Degener, Jr., Gustav de Hasperg and Paul A. Degener, co-partners, etc., Petitioners,
682 vs.
Melville Boyd, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Early & Daniel Company,

Petitioner,

685 vs.

Herbert Pearson, Receiver of the Fourth National Bank of Macon.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Meinrath Brokerage Company,

Petitioner,

688 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Brace,

Petitioner,

630 vs.

Gauger-Korsmo Construction Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fidelity Bond and Mortgage Company,
Petitioner,
631 vs.
Gauger-Kormmo Construction Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United Stateb Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jesse W. Clarke, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
68 vs.
The Haberle Crystal Springs Brewing Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file out of time a petition for rehearing in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Broad River Power Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
528 vs.
State of South Carolina ex rel.
John M. Daniel, Attorney General.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cordie Page for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the petitioners, in opposition thereto.

Powers-Kennedy Contracting Corporation, et al.
10 vs. Petitioners,
Concrete Mixing and Conveying Co.;
Concrete Mixing & Conveying Company,
11 vs. Petitioner,
R. G. Storrie & Co.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles L. Sturtevant on behalf of counsel for respondent in No. 10 and petitioner in No. 11, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles E. Townsend for the respondent in No. 11, in opposition thereto.

In the matter of: Albert T. Patrick.

The response to the notice issued pursuant to notice under Rule 2, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tom D. McKeown in behalf of Albert T. Patrick.

Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of North Dakota, et al.,
Appellants,
364 vs.
Great Northern Railway Company, et al.

The motion for leave to file brief of the Public Service Commission of Alabama, et al., as amici curiae, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Benton.

Charles H. Stange,
Petitioner,
554 vs.
The United States.

The motion to set aside part of the limitation of order granting writ of certiorari was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Guy Mason for the petitioner in support of the motion, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Joseph H. Sheppard for the respondent in opposition thereto.

——, Original.
Ex parte: William T. Kemper,
Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to withdraw the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus and/or prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

——, Original.
Ex parte: Jehudah Benjamin,
Petitioner,

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jehudah Benjamin pro se.

Pauline Gottlieb,

Appellant,

426 vs.

Mahoning Valley Sanitary District, a Corporation; City of Youngstown, Ohio, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the appellant have filed a motion to dismiss the appeal in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bain Peanut Company of Texas, et al., Appellants,

669 vs.

Dave Pinson, et al.

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gib Callaway for the appellee in support thereof, and by Mr. B. L. Agerton for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Olive S. McGrew, Petitioner,

770 vs.

John L. McGrew, and Catherine D. McGrew;

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Olive B. Lacy for the petitioner.

Olive S. McGrew, Petitioner,

771 vs.

John L. McGrew, et al.

William W. Middleton, Petitioner,

799 vs.

The People of the State of California.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Middleton, pro se.

Harvey Cox, Appellant, 524 vs. The People of the State of Colorado, et al.; Harvey Cox, Appellant, 525 vs. The People of the State of Colorado, et al.; Harvey Cox, Appellant, 526 vs. The People of the State of Colorado, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. W. Spaulding for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Colin A. Smith and Mr. J. G. Scott for the appellees in opposition thereto.
Vermont Loan & Trust Company, Appellant, 563 vs. W. D. Gillis, as Attorney General of the State of Idaho.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oliver O. Haga and Mr. W. G. Graves for the appellant.
New World Life Insurance Company, Appellant, 564 vs. W. D. Gillis, as Attorney General of the State of Idaho.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oliver O. Haga and Mr. W. G. Graves for the appellant.
Bain Peanut Company of Texas, et al., Appellants, 669 vs. Dave Pinson and G. B. Guyger.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. L. Agerton for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. Gib Calloway for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

The United States of America, Appellant,
732 vs.
James E. Farrar.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the appellant.

Utica Knitting Company, Petitioner,
611 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry A. Fellows and Mr. Henry M. Ward for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Charles R. Pollard for the respondent.

Russian Volunteer Fleet, Petitioner,
623 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Recht and Mr. Horace S. Whitman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Henry A. Cox for the respondent.

Fawcus Machine Company, Petitioner,
625 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. S. Y. Ivins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Joseph H. Sheppard for the respondent.

Autoquip Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, 627 vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. Wilmeth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. H. C. Williamson for the respondent.
Herbert Du Puy, Petitioner, 636 vs. The United States; Amy H. Du Puy, Petitioner, 637 vs. The United States.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. B. McCawley and Mr. Lamar Hardy for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Charles H. Pollard, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.
Lillian H. Warren, as executrix, etc., Petitioner, 665 vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Gilbert Hardgrove for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Heber H. Mice, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.
Saranac Automatic Machine Corporation, Petitioner, 675 vs. Wirebounds Patents Company, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. G. Paul for the petitioner.

Edward S. Rich,
Petitioner,
684 vs.
Nu-Enamel Paint Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ray Van Cott and Mr. George Sergeant for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Davis for the respondents.

W. F. Kasiska,
Petitioner,
686 vs.
Isaac McDougall, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. C. Coffin for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. G. Bissell for the respondent.

Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railway Company,
Petitioner,
690 vs.
Calvin L. McCoy.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. B. Aikman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur H. Greenwood for the respondent.

Maria Cully,
Petitioner,
691 vs.
S. D. Mitchell, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long, Mr. J. D. Houston, Mr. Peter Q. Nyce, Mr. Austin M. Gowan, and Mr. Thos. H. Owen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas J. Flannelly, Mr. Nathan A. Gibson, Mr. Joseph L. Hull, Mr. Hunter L. Johnson, and Mr. C. A. Summers for the respondents.

P. W. Brooks & Company, Inc., Petitioner,
693 vs.
North Carolina Public Service Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester Rohrlich and Mr. Frank P. Hobgood for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. S. O'B. Robinson, Jr., for the respondent.

Carbice Corporation of America, Petitioner,
695 vs.
American Patents Development Corporation, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Neave, Mr. George C. Dean, and Mr. Clarence D. Kerr for the respondents.

Claude Neon Lights, Inc., Petitioner,
698 vs.
E. Machlett & Son and Rainbow Light, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin J. Prindle, Mr. Thomas Ewing, and Mr. William Bohleber for the petitioner, and by Mr. Dean S. Edmonds and Mr. William H. Davis for the respondent.

The New Haven Bank, Executor, etc., Petitioner,
699 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Adrian C. Humphreys and Mr. Newton K. Fox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John Vaughan Groner, Mr. Paul D. Miller, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. P. S. Crewe for the respondent.

Joseph Danciger,
Petitioner,
701 vs.
Nelson Kavanaugh Smith, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. J. Ringolsky and Mr. J. M. McCormick for the petitioner.

Fridolin Pabst,
Petitioner,
702 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry A. Fellows and Mr. Camden R. McAtee for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Corning Glass Works,
Petitioner,
703 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence Graves for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Morton P. Fisher, Mr. Paul D. Miller, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Belt Railway Company of Chicago,
Petitioner,
705 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. Kemp Slaughter and Mr. Hugh C. Bickford for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Barham H. Gary, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Concordia Land & Timber Company,
Petitioner,
706 vs.
Willetts Wood Products Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. P. Bullis for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. C. Theus and Mr. J. W. House for the respondents.

Samuel Cohen,
Petitioner,
708 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Gray for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Crown Central Petroleum Corporation,
Petitioner,
709 vs.
F. J. Bates.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward S. Boyles for the petitioner.

The Cleveland Railway Company,
Petitioner,
710 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Andrew Squire and Mr. Atlee Pomerene for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Morton P. Fisher, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Charles Onley,
Petitioner,
711 vs.
Lehigh Valley Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sol Gelb for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clifton P. Williamson for the respondent.

Wood Towing Corporation, etc.,
Petitioner,
712 vs.
Southern Transportation Company, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Oast, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry H. Little, Mr. Francis S. Laws, Mr. Edward R. Baird, Jr., and Mr. George M. Lanning for the respondents.

Julia Fish, et al.,
Petitioners,
713 vs.
F. E. Kennamer, Judge of the District Court of the United States, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles West and Mr. J. M. Springer for the petitioners, and by Mr. James C. Denton, Mr. John Rogers, Mr. Joseph L. Hull, and Mr. Nathan A. Gibson for the respondent.

Security Life Insurance Company of America,
Petitioner,
714 vs.
Margaret Brimmer, Executrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James C. Jones, Jr., for the petitioner.

Oxford Paper Company,
Petitioner,
715 vs.
Steamship "Nidarholm," A. S. Nidaros.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Lawrence for the petitioner.

Clyde Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
716 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper and Mr. William J. Dean for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General John Lord O'Brian, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Charles H. Weston, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Company,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
P. M. Evans.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Jensen and Mr. C. A. Marr for the petitioner.

Charles H. Nauts, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
719 vs.
W. L. Slayton.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. T. H. Lewis, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. J. Marshall, and Mr. Thos. O. Marlar for the respondent.

Robert D. Kercheval,
Petitioner,
720 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert C. Wade and Mr. S. J. Callaway for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Christen Knudsen,
Petitioner,
721 vs.
State of Washington.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Sullivan and Mr. Roger O'Donnell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ewing Dean Colvin for the respondent.

George M. Swift,
Petitioner,
722 vs.
Martha Jackson, an incompetent, by her Guardian Ad Litem, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long, Mr. Peter Q. Nyce, Mr. J. B. Campbell, Mr. J. D. Houston, and Mr. W. D. Stanley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Webster Ballinger for the respondents.

Rosa B. Hylton,
Petitioner,
724 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Fowler for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, and Mr. Chas. H. Smith for the respondent.

Kaichiro Sugimoto,
Petitioner,
725 vs.
John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Aylett R. Cotton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Muriel E. Colthurst,
Petitioner,
726 vs.
Metropolitan Casualty Insurance Company of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph A. Burkart for the respondent.

Sam Martin, etc.,
Petitioner,
727 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jed C. Adams and Mr. W. B. Harrell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Odie Oland Owens,
Petitioner,
728 vs.
Ben B. Dancy and The State of Oklahoma.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry B. Martin for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Berry King and Mr. Wm. L. Murphy for the respondents.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
730 vs.
Harry M. Blackmer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Atlee Pomerene and Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Gordon Battle for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
731 vs.
Harry M. Blackmer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Atlee Pomerene and Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Gordon Battle for the respondent.

M. R. McGehee,
Petitioner,
733 vs.
C. W. Hall, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Garrett for the petitioner.

Frank Morris,
Petitioner,
734 vs.
Royal Indemnity Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Morris, pro se, and by Mr. Richard T. Lynch for the respondent.

Paul Jebbia and Owen Palmer,
Petitioners,
735 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin L. Rosenbloom for the petitioners, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Albert L. Lohm, Receiver, etc.,
Petitioner,
736 vs.
Bragg, Millsaps & Blackwell, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter A. Harris for the respondent.

Steamship "Waalhaven," et al.,
Petitioners,
737 vs.
Potash Importing Corporation of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Grandall and Mr. Geo. Whitefield Betts, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Carroll Single for the respondent.

Herbert Pearson, Receiver, etc.,
Petitioner,
738 vs.
Summey & Folson, Trading as Geo. M. McFadden & Bros. Agency.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Jones for the petitioner.

Archibald Courson,
Petitioner,
739 vs.
Howard Ridall.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard Cobb and Mr. Harold E. Simpson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Riley H. Heath for the respondent.

The Insurance and Title Guarantee Company,
Petitioner,
740 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh Satterlee, Mr. Alfred S. Weill, Mr. Walter C. Blakely, and Mr. Albert S. Lisenby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. Norman D. Keller, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
741 vs.
Niagara Falls Brewing Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Norman D. Keller, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the petitioner, and by Mr. Basil Robillard for the respondents.

Lehigh & Hudson River Railway Company,
Petitioner,
742 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. Kemp Slaughter and Mr. Hugh C. Bickford for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. John Vaughan Groner, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. P. S. Crewe for the respondent.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner, 743 vs. Roberta Harper Coffey.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel H. Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Curry for the respondent.
Florence B. Laws, Petitioner, 744 vs. Eleanor Bradford Davis, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter A. DeCamp for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Weld Peck for the respondents.
William Ball, Petitioner, 745 vs. Western Marine and Salvage Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence Koenigsberger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg and Mr. Louis M. Denit for the respondent.
Catherine V. Massey, Elizabeth Massey, et al., Petitioners, 747 vs. The Miller Rubber Company of New York.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Mahoney for the petitioners, and by Mr. Louis M. Denit for the respondent.

Alan Kissock, Petitioner,
748 vs.
Duquesne Steel Foundry Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harvey L. Lechner, Mr. Drury W. Cooper and Mr. John D. Morgan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lawrence Bristol for the respondents.

Jessie Margaret Budlong, Petitioner,
749 vs.
Milton J. Budlong.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court for the County of Newport, State of Rhode Island, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Jessie Margaret Budlong, pro se, and by Mr. Arthur M. Allen for the respondent.

Wrightsville & Tennille Railroad Company, Petitioner,
751 vs.
The Citizens & Southern National Bank, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander R. Lawton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles E. Wainwright for the respondents.

George T. Robinson, Trustee for Mortgage Bondholders, Petitioner,
752 vs.
S. E. Dickey, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur O. Fording for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell for the respondent.

Herkimer National Bank, Petitioner,
762 vs.
A. Grant Blue, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Snyder for the petitioner.

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred C. Hagerty, It is ordered that Arnold C. Hansen, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon H. Rifkind, It is ordered that Thomas K. O'Brien, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Vallance, It is ordered that Charles B. Hosmer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin J. Prindle, It is ordered that Russell M. Everett, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth McKellar, It is ordered that Bernard Eugene Gilbert, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, It is ordered that Annie L. Treadwell, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin J. Prindle, It is ordered that Harry B. Rook, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Stein, It is ordered that George Kerrick Perkins, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Morris, It is ordered that Thomas J. Burke, Esquire, of Bismarck, State of North Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Barbour, It is ordered that Loren A. Butts, Esquire, of Fresno, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cassius C. Dowell, It is ordered that David William Fletcher, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry Friedman, It is ordered that Emanuel M. Davidove, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh C. Smith, It is ordered that Robert E. Hannay, Jr., Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Miller, It is ordered that James H. Kane, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that Ebenezer L. Compere, Esquire, of Hamburg, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that William P. Ellis, Esquire, of Salem, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Wingo, It is ordered that M. E. Sanderson, Esquire, of Texarkana, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roscoe Patterson, It is ordered that Elton L. Marshall, Esquire, of Chillicothe, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Bowdoin Craighill, It is ordered that Thomas Byron Miller, Esquire, of Wilkes-Barre, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Bowdoin Craighill, It is ordered that Comer Morgan, Esquire, of Scranton, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

United States of America,
Appellant,
732 vs.
James E. Farrar.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown, and the case is assigned for argument following the hearing of case No. 555, United States vs. Norris, heretofore assigned for argument on Monday, April 28.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of North Dakota, et al.,
Appellants,
364 vs.
Great Northern Railway Company, Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion of counsel in that behalf for leave to file brief of the Alabama Public Service Commission, et al., as amici curiae, in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that leave be, and it is hereby granted to file the said brief with leave to counsel for the appellees to file printed brief in reply thereto within five days from this date.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of North Dakota, et al., Appellants, vs. Great Northern Railway Company, Northern Pacific Railway Company, et al.	On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. John F. Bonner, leave was granted to file brief of the Railroad and Warehouse Commission of the State of Minnesota, as amicus curiae, in this cause, with leave to counsel for the appellees to file brief in reply within five days from this date.
364	
Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. H. H. Hoppe for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.
680	
Emmett Cochran, W. M. Guice, Jr., et al. Appellants, vs. Louisiana State Board of Education, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Challen B. Ellis for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.
468	
The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Nelson B. Updike, et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis A. Brogan and Mr. Alfred C. Ellick for the respondents.
340	
Charles A. Corliss, Petitioner, vs. Frank K. Bowers, as Collector, etc.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Joseph M. Hartfield for the petitioner.
344	

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas C. Bradley, It is ordered that Sidney L. Sinnott, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Warren McLaine, It is ordered that George T. Howard, Esquire, of Panama Canal Zone, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Raymond J. Kelly, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard S. Holmes, It is ordered that W. H. L. Edwards, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stephen G. Porter, It is ordered that George Dixon Shrum, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes, It is ordered that Thomas D. Thacher, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Rogers, It is ordered that Bruce Harrison, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
509 vs.
Francisco Unzeuta.

On consideration of the motion for the issuance of the mandate forthwith in this case,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles A. Corliss,
Petitioner,
344 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, as Collector, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Joseph M. Hartfield for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Hughes for the respondent.

United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, etc.,
Petitioner,
345 vs.
P. LeRoy Harwood, as Trustee, etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Claude H. Branch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the respondents.

Georgia Power Company,

Petitioner,

363 vs.

City of Decatur.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Walter T. Colquitt for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Hooper Alexander for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Sloan, It is ordered that John E. Curtis, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that David A. Embury, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Heartsill Ragon, It is ordered that Samuel A. Clark, Esquire, of Conway, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David P. Wolhaupter, It is ordered that Raymond Ives Blakeslee, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Weld Peck, It is ordered that Milton Sayler, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dazier A. DeVane, It is ordered that Herberta Leonardy, Esquire, of Sanford, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Weld Peck, It is ordered that Frank H. Shaffer, Jr., Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Georgia Power Company, Petitioner,
363 vs.
City of Decatur.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Hooper Alexander for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Walter T. Colquit for the petitioner.

Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of North Dakota, et al., Appellants,
364 vs.
Great Northern Railway Company, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John E. Benton for the appellants, and continued by Mr. R. J. Hagman for the appellees. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Henry Escher, Ancillary Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
365 vs.
Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of the United States, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Spier Whitaker for the petitioners, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondents.

City of Cincinnati,

Petitioner,

372 vs.

Margaret W. Vester;

City of Cincinnati,

Petitioner,

373 vs.

James S. Richards, et al.;

City of Cincinnati,

Petitioner,

374 vs.

Llewellyn B. Reakirt.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. John D. Ellis for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, APRIL 21, 1930.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elton L. Marshall, It is ordered that Walter E. Sloat, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alton L. Marshall, It is ordered that Stratton Shartel, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Chalmers G. Graham, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. King, It is ordered that Edwin S. Murphy, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond S. Morris, It is ordered that Thomas A. Kane, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Woodson P. Houghton, It is ordered that T. T. Oughterson, Esquire, of Stuart, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Sloan, It is ordered that Walter D. James, Esquire, of Cambridge, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bird J. Vincent, It is ordered that Edward W. Fehling, Esquire, of St. Johns, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elton L. Marshall, It is ordered that Alexander M. Meyer, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that Raymond S. Wilkins, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Benjamin A. Levy, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Leo Golden, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Jr., It is ordered that Elmer B. Collins, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that Elton J. Layton, Esquire, of Silver Spring, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marvin Jones, It is ordered that James E. Anderson, Esquire, of Amarillo, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. Attorney General Mitchell presented Hon. Thomas D. Thacher, Solicitor General of the United States, and it was ordered that his commission be recorded, which said commission is in the words and figures following, viz:

HERBERT HOOVER,
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

To all who shall see these Presents, Greeting:

Know Ye; That reposing special trust and confidence in ~~in~~ the Wisdom, Uprightness, and Learning of Thomas D. Thacher, of New York, I have nominated, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him Solicitor General, and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulful the duties of that Office according to the Constitution and Laws of the said United States, and to Have and to Hold the said Office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining, unto Him, the said Thomas D. Thacher, during the pleasure of the President.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have caused these Letters to be made patent and the seal of the Department of Justice to be hereunto affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this twenty-second day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirty, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and fifty-fourth.

(Signed) Herbert Hoover

(S E A L)

By the President:

William D. Mitchell,
Attorney General.

Mr. Justice Holmes announced the following orders of the Court:

State of Wisconsin, State of Minnesota, State of Ohio, and State of Pennsylvania, Complainants,

7, Original. vs.

State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, Defendants,

State of Missouri, State of Kentucky, State of Tennessee, State of Louisiana, State of Mississippi, and State of Arkansas, Intervening Defendants;

State of Michigan, Complainant,

11, Original. vs.

State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al., Defendants;

State of New York, Complainant,

12, Original. vs.

State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al., Defendants.

D E C R E E.

These Causes came on to be heard upon the pleadings, evidence, and the exceptions filed by the parties to the Report of the Special Master, as well as on the exceptions filed to the Report of the Special Master on Re-reference, and were argued by counsel. The Court now being fully advised in the premises, and for the purpose of carrying into effect the conclusions set forth in the opinions of this Court announced January 14, 1929, (278 U.S. 367), and April 14, 1930,

It is now here Ordered, Adjudged, and Decreed as follows:

1. On and after July 1, 1930, the defendants, the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, their employees and agents, and all persons assuming to act under the authority of either of them, be and they hereby are enjoined from diverting any of the waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system or watershed through the Chicago Drainage Canal and its auxiliary channels or otherwise in excess of an annual average of 6,500 cubic feet per second in addition to domestic pumpage.

2. That on and after December 31, 1935, unless good cause be shown to the contrary, the defendants, the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, their employees and agents, and all persons assuming to act under the authority of either of them, be and they hereby are enjoined from diverting any of the waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system or watershed through

the Chicago Drainage Canal and its auxiliary channels or otherwise in excess of an annual average of 5,000 cubic feet per second in addition to domestic pumpage.

3. That on and after December 31, 1938, unless good cause be shown to the contrary, the defendants, the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, their employees and agents, and all persons assuming to act under the authority of either of them, be and they hereby are enjoined from diverting any of the waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system or watershed through the Chicago Drainage Canal and its auxiliary channels or otherwise in excess of the annual average of 1,500 cubic feet per second in addition to domestic pumpage.

4. That the provisions of this decree as to the diverting of the waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system or watershed relate to the flow diverted by the defendants exclusive of the water drawn by the City of Chicago for domestic water supply purposes and entering the Chicago River and its branches or the Calumet River or the Chicago Drainage Canal as sewage. The amount so diverted is to be determined by deducting from the total flow at Lockport the amount of water pumped by the City of Chicago into its water mains and as so computed will include the run-off of the Chicago and Calumet drainage area.

5. That the defendant the Sanitary District of Chicago shall file with the clerk of this Court semi-annually on July first and January first of each year, beginning July first, 1930, a report to this Court adequately setting forth the progress made in the construction of the sewage treatment plants and appurtenances outlined in the program as proposed by the Sanitary District of Chicago, and also setting forth the extent and effects of the operation of the sewage treatment plants, respectively, that shall have been placed in operation, and also the average diversion of water from Lake Michigan during the period from the entry of this decree down to the date of such report.

6. That on the coming in of each of said reports, and on due notice to the other parties, any of the parties to the above entitled suits, complainants or defendants, may apply to the Court for such action or relief, either with respect to the time to be allowed for the construction, or the progress of construction, or the methods of operation, of any of said sewage treatment plants, or with respect to the diversion of water from Lake Michigan, as may be deemed to be appropriate.

7. That any of the parties hereto, complainants or defendants, may, irrespective of the filing of the above-described reports, apply at the foot of this decree for any other or further action or relief, and this Court retains jurisdiction of the above-entitled suits for the purpose of any order or direction, or modification of this decree, or any supplemental decree, which it may deem at any time to be proper in relation to the subject matter in controversy.

And it is Further Ordered that the costs in these cases shall be taxable against the defendants.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

State of Wisconsin, State of Minnesota, State of Ohio, and State of Pennsylvania, Complainants,

7, Original. vs.

State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, Defendants.

State of Missouri, State of Kentucky, State of Tennessee, State of Louisiana, State of Mississippi, and State of Arkansas, Intervening Defendants.

State of Michigan, Complainant,

11, Original. vs.

State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al., Defendants.

State of New York, Complainant,

12, Original. vs.

State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al., Defendants.

O R D E R.

The Court having considered the suggestions of the several parties does now, in view of its established practice, fix the compensation of Charles Evans Hughes, as Master upon the original and supplemental references in these cases, at thirty thousand dollars ($30,000), and in addition thereto allows his expenses actually incurred for printing, stenography, travel, and other items amounting to $2,775.90, all of the above to be taxed as costs in the causes.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration of the matters involved in this order.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

William J. Stratton, Secretary of State of Illinois,
Appellant,
98 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company.

It is now here ordered by the Court that this case be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket for reargument.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Powers-Kennedy Contracting Corporation, et al.,
Petitioners,
10 vs.
Concrete Mixing and Conveying Company;
Concrete Mixing and Conveying Company,
Petitioner,
11 vs.
R. C. Storrie & Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Broad River Power Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
528 vs.
The State of South Carolina, ex rel. John M. Daniel, Attorney General.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Friday, May 2 next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles H. Stange,
Petitioner,
554 vs.
United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to set aside part of limitation of order granting the writ of certiorari in this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ex Parte:
Jehudah Benjamin, Petitioner,
—, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of habeas corpus herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Olive S. McGrew,
Petitioner,
770 vs.
John L. McGrew and Catherine D. McGrew.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Olive S. McGrew,
Petitioner,
770 vs.
John L. McGrew and Catherine D. McGrew.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Olive S. McGrew, Petitioner, vs. John L. McGrew and Catherine D. McGrew. 771

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Olive S. McGrew, Petitioner, vs. John L. McGrew and Catherine D. McGrew. 771

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William W. Middleton, Petitioner, vs. The People of the State of California. 799

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William W. Middleton,
Petitioner,
799 vs.
The People of the State of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, 3rd Appellate District, State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, 3rd Appellate District, State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harvey Cox,
Appellant,
524 vs.
The People of the State of Colorado, et al.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of jurisdiction in this case be postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harvey Cox,
Appellant,
525 vs.
The People of the State of Colorado,
The Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado, et al., etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harvey Cox,
Appellant,
526 vs.
The People of the State of Colorado, The Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado, et al., etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Vermont Loan & Trust Company,
Appellant,
563 vs.
W. D. Gillis, as Attorney General of the State of Idaho.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New World Life Insurance Company,
Appellant,
564 vs.
W. D. Gillis, as Attorney General of the State of Idaho.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bain Peanut Company of Texas, et al.,
Appellants,
669 vs.
Dave Pinson, et al.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of jurisdiction and of the motion to dismiss in this cause be postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Russian Volunteer Fleet,
Petitioner,
623 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fawcus Machine Company,
Petitioner,
625 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Saranac Automatic Machine Corporation,
Petitioner,
675 vs.
Wirebounds Patents Company, et al.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Carbice Corporation of America,
Petitioner,
695 vs.
American Patents Development Corporation and Dry Ice Corporation of America.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Utica Knitting Company,

Petitioner,

611 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Herbert DuPuy,

Petitioner,

636 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Amy H. DuPuy,

Petitioner,

637 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lillian R. Warren, as executrix of the estate of James Vinson Wiggins,

665 vs. Petitioner,

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward S. Rich,

Petitioner,

684 vs.

Nu-Enamel Paint Company, a corporation, Charles Lloyd, O. A. Parsons, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. F. Kasiska,

Petitioner,

686 vs.

Isaac McDougall, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Xavier Servel, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railway Company, Petitioner,

690 vs.

Calvin L. McCoy.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Maria Cully,

Petitioner,

691 vs.

S. D. Mitchell, C. B. Billington, E. W.Whitney, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

P. W. Brooks & Company, Incorporated,

Petitioner,

693 vs.

North Carolina Public Service Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Claude Neon Lights, Inc.,

Petitioner,

698 vs.

E. Machlett & Son and Railbow Light, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The New Haven Bank, Executor of
Joseph E. Hubinger, Deceased,
Petitioner,
699 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph Danciger,
Petitioner,
701 vs.
Nelson Kavanaugh Smith, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fridolin Pabst,
Petitioner,
702 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Corning Glass Works,

Petitioner,

703 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Belt Railway Company of Chicago,

Petitioner,

705 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Concordia Land & Timber Company,

Petitioner,

706 vs.

Willetts Wood Products Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Samuel Cohen,
Petitioner,
708 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Crown Central Petroleum Corporation,
Petitioner,
709 vs.
F. J. Bates.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Cleveland Railway Company,
Petitioner,
710 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles Onley, Petitioner, vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

711

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wood Towing Corporation, Owner of Steamtugs "Alvah H. Boushell" and "C. H. Hix," Petitioner, vs. Southern Transportation Company, a corporation, owner of barges "Champlain" and "Charleston,", et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

712

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

O R D E R.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the call of the docket be suspended for the term on Friday, May 2 next, and that the Court will take a recess from Monday, May 5, until Monday, May 19 next.

It is further ordered by this Court that no petitions for writs of certiorari or other motions, except motions for admission to practice, will be received after Monday, May 26 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mead-Morrison Manufacturing Company, Appellant, vs. Russell B. Marchant, as Trustee, etc. 570

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace L. Lohnes on behalf of counsel for the appellees.

Daisy D. Perkins, Appellant, vs. The State of Ohio. 831

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

Counsel for the appellee having filed in open Court the following certificate, to-wit:

"IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO.

Daisy D. Perkins,

Case No. 21,741

The State of Ohio.

STATE OF OHIO, } ss:
FRANKLIN COUNTY, }

I, Seba H. Miller, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that on the 4th day of May, 1929, a motion for leave to file was filed in this court and that on the 12th day of June, said motion was overruled; that on the 21st day of June, 1929, a petition in error as of right was filed. On the 2nd day of July, motion by defendant in error to dismiss the petition as of right was filed and that on the 6th day of October, said motion to dismiss was sustained; that on October 4th, a re-hearing on the motion for leave to file said petition in error was denied. On October 9th, the petition in error filed as of right, was dismissed on the grounds that there was no debatable constitutional questions involved. On October 21st, a motion for a re-hearing was denied.

On October 31st, a petition for permission to appeal to the United States Supreme Court was filed and allowed by Marshall, Chief Justice, said appeal to be filed by the first day of December, 1929. On November 9th, citation and acknowledgement of service was filed. On November 25th, the transcript on appeal and all papers relating to same were sent by me to the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court at Washington, D. C., by special delivery mail.

And I do hereby certify that the foregoing memoranda of pleas, orders, decrees, etc., are truely taken and correctly copied from the records of the said Supreme Court, towit: Minute Book No. 42, pages Nos. 641 and 642.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the seal of the Supreme Court of Ohio, this 1st day of March, A. D., 1930.

(SEAL) (signed) Seba H. Miller,
Clerk of the Supreme Court of Ohio.

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the eleventh rule.

AND IT APPEARING TO THE COURT that the appellant has failed to have her cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

IT IS NOW HERE ORDERED AND ADJUDGED by this Court that the appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of the State of Ohio to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The City of Cincinnati, Petitioner,
372 vs.
Margaret W. Vester;
The City of Cincinnati, Petitioner,
373 vs.
James S. Richards, et al.;
The City of Cincinnati, Petitioner,
374 vs.
Llewellyn B. Reakirt.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. John D. Ellis, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Ohio, as amicus curiae, in these causes.

Orenstein and Koppel Aktiengesellschaft, Petitioner,
717 vs.
Koppel Industrial Car and Equipment Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, Mr. John A. Kratz, and Mr. Godfrey L. Munter for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. Dean Hill Stanley, Mr. Arthur Garfield Hays, and Mr. Wm. Cattron Rigby for the petitioner, in opposition thereto.

The Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Railway Company, et al., Appellants, 642 vs. The United States of America, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank H. Moore, Mr. W. E. Davis, Mr. M. C. Roberts, Mr. C. H. Muckley, Mr. C. S. Burg, Mr. Robert Thompson, Mr. E. T. Miller, Mr. J. R. Bell, Mr. H. H. Larimore, Mr. J. R. Turney, and Mr. S. W. Moore for the appellants.
The United States of America, et al., Appellants, 643 vs. The Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Railway Company, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, Mr. Elmer B. Collins, and Mr. Edward M. Reidy for the appellants.
W. C. Clark, Appellant, 681 vs. A. J. Maxwell, Commissioner, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albers L. Cox for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Dennis G. Brummitt for the appellees in opposition thereto.
Railway Express Agency, Inc., Appellant, 696 vs. The Commonwealth of Virginia.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wyndham R. Meredeth, Mr. Harry S. Marx, and Mr. Albert M. Hartung for the appellant.

Abie State Bank, Appellant, 750 vs. Arthur J. Weaver, as Governor, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank H. Gaines, and Mr. Leonard A. Flansburg for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. C. A. Sorensen and Mr. Charles E. Abbott for the appellees in opposition thereto.
George A. Bew, Petitioner, 694 vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Palmer Ingram, Mr. George E. Shields, and Mr. George A. King for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Joseph H. Sheppard for the respondent.
Emil Hansen, Permanent Receiver, etc., Petitioner, 758 vs. E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Company, Inc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Emil Hansen, pro se, and by Mr. George H. Bond and Mr. William H. Button for the respondent.
Charles F. Silva, Petitioner, 759 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, Petitioner, 768 vs. Northern Pacific Railroad Company, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton and Mr. Nelson Thomas for the petitioner, and by Mr. M. J. Hagman, Mr. D. F. Lyons, and Mr. F. G. Dorety for the respondents.
American Mutual Liability Insurance Company, Petitioner, 769 vs. W. H. McCaffrey, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Palmer Hutcheson and Mr. Benjamin Brooks for the petitioner.
Miller Brothers Company, Petitioner, 772 vs. Lektophone Corporation.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Davis for the respondent.
Louisiana Oil Refining Corporation, Petitioner, 773 vs. Harry L. Reed, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leon O'Quin and Mr. H. C. Walker, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank J. Looney for the respondents.

William W. Wheelock, et al., Petitioners,
776 vs.
Dora E. Norton, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph T. Finley, Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Lon O. Hocker, Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, Mr. James C. Jones, Jr., and Mr. Silas H. Strawn for the petitioners, and by Mr. David W. Hill for the respondent.

Annette Aiken, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
777 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. Marlton Mosteller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Lillie B. Thompson, et al., Petitioners,
778 vs.
Houston Oil Company, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William D. Gordon for the petitioners.

Frank Guile, et al., Petitioners,
779 vs.
E. M. Statler, as Owner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. B. Axtell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles E. Hickox and Mr. Edwin S. Murphy for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
800 vs.
Anthony LaFranca.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb for the respondent.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,
370 vs.
Western Meat Company, et al.

This case was continued per stipulation of counsel.

The City of Cincinnati, Petitioner,
372 vs.
Margaret W. Vester;
The City of Cincinnati, Petitioner,
373 vs.
James S. Richards, et al.;
The City of Cincinnati, Petitioner,
374 vs.
Llewellyn B. Reakirt.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. John D. Ellis for the petitioner, by Mr. John Weld Peck for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Ed F. Alexander for the petitioner.

Western Cartridge Company, Petitioner,
375 vs.
Louis L. Emmerson, Secretary of State, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Colin C. H. Fyffe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Bayard Lacey Catron for the respondent.

Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Company,
389 vs. Petitioner,
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Stanton C. Peelle for the petitioner.

TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. Garner, It is ordered that Harry Carstarphen, Esquire, of Hannibal, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter W. McCaslin, It is ordered that James L. Krusemark, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Deneen, It is ordered that La Verne Morris, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal E. Burnham, It is ordered that Delvaille H. Theard, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that Maury Kemp, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Sullivan, It is ordered that Julian C. Ryer, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

In re disbarment of Albert T. Patrick: O R D E R.

It having been brought to the attention of the Court, by the filing of a certified copy of the disbarment order, that Albert T. Patrick has been disbarred from the practice of the law by the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, First Department; and a notice having issued to him by order of this Court entered on February 24th last pursuant to Rule 2, par. 5 of the Rules of this Court, suspending him from the practice and notifying him to show cause why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court; and the said Patrick having filed his response to such notice;

It is now here ordered that the disbarment order of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, First Department, the notice issued pursuant to the order of this Court of February 24, 1930, the response thereto filed April 12, 1930, with the exhibits thereto attached, be, and the same are hereby, referred to Mr. Nathan L. Miller, of New York, State of New York, to Mr. Charles C. Burlingham, of New York, State of New York, and to Mr. Henry W. Taft, of New York, State of New York, as a committee of the bar of this Court, to make such inquiry into the matter as may be necessary or appropriate, and thereupon to make a report and recommendation respecting the final action to be taken therein by this Court conformably to Rule 2, par. 5, of the Rules of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

O R D E R.

In re disbarment of H. A. Ledbetter:

It having been brought to the attention of the Court, by the filing of a certified copy of the disbarment order, that H. A. Ledbetter has been disbarred from the practice of the law by the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma; and a notice having issued to him by order of this Court entered on February 24th last pursuant to Rule 2, par. 5 of the Rules of this Court, suspending him from the practice and notifying him to show cause why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court; and the said Ledbetter having filed his response and answer to such notice;

It is now here ordered that the disbarment order of the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, the notice issued pursuant to the order of this Court of February 24, 1930, the response and answer thereto filed April 2, 1930, with exhibits attached thereto, be, and the same are hereby, referred to Mr. Thomas Francis Howe, of Chicago, State of Illinois, to Mr. William L. Frierson, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, and to Mr. W. H. H. Piatt, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, as a committee of the bar of this Court, to make such inquiry into the matter as may be necessary or appropriate, and thereupon to make a report and recommendation respecting the final action to be taken herein by this Court conformably to Rule 2, par. 5, of the Rules of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James J. Martin, alias James J. Ryan,

Appellant,

835 vs.

Leslie Rudolph, Warden of the
Missouri State Penitentiary.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

Mr. Walter E. Sloat, counsel for the appellee herein, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to-wit:

"State of Missouri - - Set.

I, J. D. Allen, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, hereby certify that in a cause entitled Ex parte James J. Martin, alias James J. Ryan, petitioner, against Leslie Rudolph, Warden of the Missouri State Penitentiary, respondent, a petition for a writ of habeas corpus was filed on April 1st, 1929, and on the 9th day of April, 1929, a judgment was entered herein denying a writ. And I further certify that said petitioner did on the 15th day of April, 1929 file herein a petition for a writ of error (or appeal) and that on said date a writ of error (or appeal) was granted to said petitioner by the Honorable John Turner White, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Missouri, to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Witness my hand and the seal of said Court. Done at my office in the City of Jefferson this 3rd day of April, 1930.

(SEAL) (Signed) J. D. Allen,
Clerk, Supreme Court of Missouri."

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the eleventh rule.

And it appearing to the Court that the appellant has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court;

And it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of the State of Missouri to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Junius C. Klein, Appellant, 442 vs. Board of Tax Supervisors of Jefferson County, Kentucky.	This case was continued per stipulation of counsel.
Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Petitioner, 389 vs. The United States.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the respondent and concluded by Mr. Stanton C. Peelle for the petitioner.
Inez M. Jamison, et al., Petitioners, 390 vs. Valentin Encarnacion.	This case was argued by Mr. Theodore H. Lord for the petitioners, and by Mr. James A. Gray for the respondent.
Charter Shipping Company, Ltd., 397 vs. Petitioner, Bowring, Jones & Tidy, Ltd.	This case was argued on the motion to dismiss by Mr. Theodore L. Bailey for the respondent.
Charter Shipping Company, Ltd., 397 vs. Petitioner, Bowring, Jones & Tidy, Ltd.	On consideration of the motion to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
Charter Shipping Company, Ltd., 397 vs. Petitioner, Bowring, Jones & Tidy, Ltd.	This case was argued by Mr. Cletus Keating for the petitioner, and by Mr. Theodore L. Bailey for the respondent.
Mari Tollefsen Todok, et al., 412 vs. Petitioners, Union State Bank of Harvard, Nebraska, et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Frank E. Edgerton for the petitioners, and by Mr. Walter D. James for the respondents.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23,1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul F. Myers, It is ordered that John S. Sinclair, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Hickey, It is ordered that Leonard J. Meyberg, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon H. Rifkind, It is ordered that Charles C. Flaesch, Esquire, of Unadilla, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Hughes, Jr., It is ordered that John Fletcher Caskey, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. B. Des Jardins, It is ordered that Harold Elno Smith, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul F. Myers, It is ordered that John R. Yates, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

James E. Tyler, Jr., et al., Administrators, etc., Petitioners,
428 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Russell L. Bradford, leave was granted to file brief of Edward H. Blane and Russell L. Bradford, as amici curiae.

Thomas A. Baldwin, et al., etc., Plaintiffs in error and Appellants,
417 vs.
State of Missouri.

This case was argued by Mr. Harry Carstarphen and Mr. John F. Garner for the plaintiffs in error and appellants, and by Mr. Stratton Shartel and Mr. A. M. Meyer for the defendant in error and appellee.

Ike Danovitz, surviving partner of Feitler Bottle Company, Claimants, Petitioner,
424 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Ward Bonsall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Sisson for the respondent.

Panama Mail Steamship Company, Petitioner,
425 vs.
Ernestina Isabelle Vargas.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Thomas A. Thacher for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the respondent.

THURSDAY, APRIL 24, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis P. Burns, It is ordered that Al C. Kammer, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis P. Burns, It is ordered that William F. Conkerton, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, It is ordered that Jack Bernard Pate, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Lake, It is ordered that Reginald B. Williams, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph G. Myerson, It is ordered that Charles G. Lee, Jr., Esquire, of Ashville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Barger, It is ordered that Patrick J. Friel, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

S. O. Wynne, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.,
510 vs.
Swanson Chemical Corporation.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Harry S. Barger, leave was granted Mr. Michael Serody to appear and present oral argument pro hac vice for Swanson Chemical Corporation.

Panama Mail Steamship Company, Petitioner,
425 vs.
Ernestina Isabelle Vargas.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. H. W. Hutton for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Thomas A. Thacher for the petitioner.

James E. Tyler, Jr., et al., Administrators, etc., Petitioners,
428 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Frank S. Bright for the petitioners, and by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

The United States of America,
546 vs. Petitioner,
Provident Trust Company of Pennsylvania, et al., etc.;
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
547 vs.
Girard Trust Company, et al.

These cases were argued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioners, and by Mr. John S. Sinclair for the respondents.

The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission,

Appellants,

395 vs.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellants, and continued by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellee.

FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Kerr, It is ordered that J. M. Feigenbaum, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. H. Sutton, It is ordered that Harold O. Clayton, Esquire, of South Bend, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard D. Daniels, It is ordered that W. S. Babcock, Esquire, of Sandusky, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Wolfe, It is ordered that Vine H. Smith, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. W. Wolfe, It is ordered that Milton Pinkus, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Parker, It is ordered that Fontaine C. Bradley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Frank Morris, Petitioner,	On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Winship Wheatley for the petitioner, leave was granted to file amended and supplemental petition for writ of certiorari and brief in support thereof.
734 vs.	
Royal Indemnity Company.	
The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants,	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellants.
395 vs.	
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company.	

Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
443 vs.
Galeno Chemical Co., Inc., et al.;
Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
444 vs.
D. P. Paul and Company, Inc.;
Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
445. vs.
W. H. Long & Company, Inc.;
S. O. Wynne, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.,
510 vs.
Swanson Chemical Corporation;
James M. Doran, Prohibition Commissioner, etc., et al.,
511 vs.
Martin H. Casper, Trading as Delmar Mfg. & Chemical Co.

These cases were argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioners in Nos. 443, 444, and 445; for Wynne, Federal Prohibition Administrator, in No. 510; and for Doran, Prohibition Commissioner in No. 511; and by Mr. John Fletcher Caskey for the respondents in Nos. 443, and 444, and submitted by Mr. Lewis Landes for the respondent in No. 445; by Mr. Harry S. Barger for Swanson Chemical Corporation in No. 510; and by Mr. Patrick J. Friel for Casper, Trading as Delmar Mfg. & Chemical Co., in No. 511.

Richbourg Motor Company,
Petitioner,
452 vs.
The United States of America;
Davies Motors, Inc.,
Petitioner,
569 vs.
The United States of America.

These cases were argued by Mr. Joseph G. Myerson for the petitioner in No. 452; by Mr. Duane R. Dills for the petitioner in No. 569; and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the respondent.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse P. Crawford, It is ordered that Franklin T. Voelker, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. P. Freeling, It is ordered that Edward M. Box, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Villard Martin, It is ordered that Richard K. Bridges, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic L. Ballard, It is ordered that Allen Hunter White, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer B. Collins, It is ordered that Charles E. Cotterill, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Smith O'Brien, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman J. Galloway, It is ordered that Myron Melvin Cohen, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Rea Williams, It is ordered that Alexander P. Stewart, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Rea Williams, It is ordered that Frank C. Mann, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, It is ordered that Raymond Parmer, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Lawrence, It is ordered that John C. Leroh, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. B. McClintock, It is ordered that Aloys C. Link, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stephen G. Porter, It is ordered that John G. Whitmore, Esquire, of Ridgway, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stephen G. Porter, It is ordered that Charles J. Margiotti, Esquire, of Punxsutawney, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard L. Merrick, It is ordered that Hallock P. Long, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter A. Scott, It is ordered that Charles M. Candy, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Yates, It is ordered that Isadore Isenberg, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Matthias Concannon, It is ordered that Franklin E. Vaughan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Everett Sanders, It is ordered that Warren E. Miller, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence J. McLeod, It is ordered that Arthur Gladstone, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Lewis, It is ordered that James A. Cresswell, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles A. Corliss,

Petitioner,

344 vs.

Frank K. Bowers, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of New York.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice took no part in this case.

Henry Escher, Ancillary Administrator of Jak. Robert Sigg-Fehr, Deceased; Gottfried Rudolph Baumann-Kienast, and Edmund Gams, Petitioners, vs. Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of the United States, and Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian.

365 — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Emmett Cochran, W. M. Guice, Jr., Henry Steinau, et al;, Appellants, vs. Louisiana State Board of Education, et al.

468 — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

O R D E R.

In re Leroy B. Delaney.

On consideration of the motion of Arthur O. Fording, and of the exhibits filed in support thereof, in which it is alleged that Leroy B. Delaney, a member of the bar of this Court now resident in France, is an unfit person to be a member of the bar of this Court,

It is now here ordered that so much of the said motion as prays that notice be issued to the said Delaney to show cause why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court is granted; and it is ordered that notice issue to the said Delaney to show cause, on or before the first Monday in October next, why he should not be so disbarred.

It is further ordered that in all other respects the motion of the said Fording be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mead-Morrison Manufacturing Company, Appellant,
570 vs.
Russell B. Marchant, as Trustee, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Orenstein and Koppel Aktiengesellschaft, Petitioner,
717 vs.
Koppel Industrial Car and Equipment Company.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the motion to vacate, dismiss or affirm in this cause be postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Railway Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, and Interstate Commerce Commission.	On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
642	
The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission, Appellants, vs. The Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Railway Company, et al.	On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
643	
W. C. Clark, Appellant, vs. A. J. Maxwell, Commissioner, etc.	It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of jurisdiction of this Court be postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
681	
Railway Express Agency, Inc., Appellant, vs. The Commonwealth of Virginia.	It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court be postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
696	
Abie State Bank, Appellant, vs. Arthur J. Weaver, as Governor, etc.	It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court be postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
750	

Oxford Paper Company,
Petitioner,
715 vs.
Steamship "Nidarholm," A. S. Nidaros.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles H. Nauts, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
719 vs.
W. L. Slayton.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
741 vs.
Niagara Falls Brewing Company and Paul A. Schoellkopf, et al., etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Julia Fish, et al.,

Petitioners,

715 vs.

F. E. Kennamer, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Security Life Insurance Company of America,

Petitioner,

714 vs.

Margaret Brimmer, Executrix of the Last Will and Testament of Estella D. Clabaugh, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Clyde Steamship Company,

Petitioner,

716 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Smelting, Refining
and Mining Company,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
P. M. Evans.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert D. Kercheval,
Petitioner,
720 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Christen Knudsen,
Petitioner,
721 vs.
State of Washington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George M. Swift,

Petitioner,

722 vs.

Martha Jackson, an incompetent, by her Guardian Ad Litem, James H. Genert, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Rosa B. Hylton,

Petitioner,

724 vs.

Southern Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Kaichiro Sugimoto,

Petitioner,

725 vs.

John D. Nagle, as Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of San Francisco.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the ~~Sixth~~ Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Muriel E. Colthurst,

Petitioner,

726 vs.

Metropolitan Casualty Insurance Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sam Martin, alias Sam Lachinsky, alias H. H. Rachofsky, etc.,

Petitioner,

727 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Hughes.

Odie Oland Owens,

Petitioner,

728 vs.

Ben B. Dancy and The State of Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Harry M. Blackmer. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

730

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Harry M. Blackmer. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

731

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

M. R. McGehee, Petitioner, vs. C. W. Hall, Trustee of Orlando Paper Company, a corporation, Bankrupt. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

733

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Paul Jebbia and Owen Palmer,
Petitioners,
735 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Albert L. Lohm, Receiver of the First National Bank of Dublin,
Petitioner,
736 vs.
Bragg, Millsaps & Blackwell, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Steamship "Waalhaven," N. V. Maats, S. S. "Wallhaven," et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
737 vs.
Potash Importing Corporation of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Herbert Pearson, Receiver of the
Fourth National Bank of Macon,
Georgia,
Petitioner,
738 vs.
Summey & Tolson, Trading as Geo. M.
McFadden & Bro. Agency.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Archibald Gourson,
Petitioner,
739 vs.
Howard Ridall.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Insurance and Title Guarantee
Company,
Petitioner,
740 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William A. Sherman, et al., etc.,
486 vs.
The United States of America.

The joint motion for a writ of certiorari to bring up the entire record and cause herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in that behalf.

The Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Railway Company, et al.,
Appellants,
642 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
The United States of America, et al.,
Appellants,
643 vs.
The Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Railway Company, et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Rae Williams in behalf of counsel for the appellants in No. 642 and appellees in No. 643.

Frank L. Smith, et al.,
Appellants,
845 vs.
Illinois Bell Telephone Company.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Beck in behalf of counsel for the appellants.

Gabriel Toombs,
Appellant,
485 vs.
Citizens Bank of Waynesboro.

This case was submitted on printed briefs, per stipulation of counsel under Rule 25.

L. B. Ivey, et al.,
Appellants,
670 vs.
J. R. Kelling, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas E. Hayden, Jr., for the appellants.

O. W. Holmes,
Appellant,
674 vs.
City of Fayetteville.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. L. Brooks for the appellant.

Henry Escher, Ancilliary Administrator, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
697 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Spier Whitaker, Mr. Lawrence A. Baker, Mr. Lyttleton Fox, and Mr. Henry Ravenel for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Southwest Power Company,
Petitioner,
723 vs.
Ruth Ann Price, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. McDonough, and Mr. Frank M. Kemp for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. H. Fuller, Mr. Geo. M. Porter and Mr. Harry P. Warner for the respondent.

Mann Carter and Will Carter,
Petitioners,
766 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Reuben R. Arnold, Mr. T. W. Hardwick, Mr. E. K. Wilcox and Mr. Lee W. Branch for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Mann Carter and Will Carter,
Petitioners,
767 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Reuben R. Arnold, Mr. T. W. Hardwick, Mr. E. K. Wilcox and Mr. Lee W. Branch for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Joseph Riesenman, Sr., et al.,
Petitioners,
774 vs.
John L. Nesbit, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carl E. Glock for the petitioners, and by Mr. John L. Nesbit for the respondents.

Hattie B. Wilson, as Administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
775 vs.
Lehigh Valley Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Israel G. Holender for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas R. Wheeler for the respondent.

Odil Labbee,
Petitioner,
781 vs.
Thavenot Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence E. Mellen for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. W. Griffin and Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith for the respondent.

The Indianapolis Union Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
782 vs.
Cincinnati, Indianapolis & Western Railroad Company;
The Indianapolis Union Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
783 vs.
Cincinnati, Indianapolis & Western Railroad Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph J. Daniels, Mr. Joseph S. Graydon, and Mr. H. N. Quigley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Murray Seasongood, Mr. Lester A. Jaffe, and Mr. F. J. Goebel for the respondents.

Martin Reider, Petitioner,
784 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Middlekauff for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Kly & Walker Dry Goods Company, Petitioner,
787 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry J. Richardson, Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, and Mr. Thomas W. White for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Barham R. Gary, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Douglas F. Fesler,
Petitioner,
793 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter L. Fisher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John H. McEvers, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

John M. Wright, as County Treasurer, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
797 vs.
The Central National Bank of Topeka, Kansas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. B. Quinton and Mr. Eugene S. Quinton for the petitioners, and by Mr. John L. Hunt and Mr. S. M. Brewster for the respondent.

Blackburn Construction Company, etc.,
Petitioner,
798 vs.
The Cedar Rapids National Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stephen A. George for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. H. Sargent for the respondent.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
801 vs.
W. A. Aaron.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 6th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jos. H. T. Bibb and Mr. T. D. Gresham for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondent.

Twin City Water Softener Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. American Doucil Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. A. Whiteley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Harvey L. Lechner and Mr. Paul Synnestvedt for the respondent.
802	
The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Alfred E. Norris.	This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic L. Ballard for the respondent.
555	
The United States of America, Appellant, vs. James E. Farrar.	This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the appellant, and by Mr. William H. Lewis for the appellee.
732	
Edward Eliason, et al., Appellants, vs. Charles Wilborn, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Matthias Concannon for the appellants.
347	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gilbert L. Hall, It is ordered that John C. Sherriff, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vine H. Smith, It is ordered that Thomas J. Cuff, Esquire, of Hempstead, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Shipman Andrews, It is ordered that Harry Huse Skerritt, Esquire, of Syracuse, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carver W. Wolfe, It is ordered that John B. Shaw, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Carl Garner Stearns, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. A. Youngquist, It is ordered that Edward Arms Knapp, Esquire, of Saint Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roscoe C. Patterson, It is ordered that Laurance Mastick Hyde, Esquire, of Princeton, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roscoe C. Patterson, It is ordered that Nelson Enoch Johnson, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. H. Tallichet, It is ordered that John P. Bullington, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Edward Eliason, et al., Appellants,

347 vs.

Charles Wilborn, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Matthias Concannon for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. Floyd E. Thompson for the appellees.

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
454 vs.
William Lowe, doing business under the trade name of Capitol Hill Gin Company.

This case was argued by Mr. S. P. Freeling and Mr. E. S. Ratliff for the appellants, and by Mr. Robert M. Rainey for the appellees.

Alpha Steamship Corporation, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
457 vs.
Robert Cain.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Carver W. Wolfe for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Vine H. Smith for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred H. Davis, It is ordered that F. C. Hillyer, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Munson H. Lane, It is ordered that Joseph E. Mitchell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James E. Watson, It is ordered that Harriet Buckingham, of Osgood, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that T. Baldwin Martin, Esquire, of Macon, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Riley J. Wilson, It is ordered that Thomas Wynn Holloman, Esquire, of Alexandria, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Sisson, It is ordered that James G. Connolly, Esquire, of Pawtucket, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. S. Y. Ivins, It is ordered that Dorothea M. Wassmann, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas D. Lyons, It is ordered that Conn Linn, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Burns Poe, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
492 vs.
H. G. Seaborn.

This case was continued per stipulation of counsel.

Alpha Steamship Corporation, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
457 vs.
Robert Cain.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Vine H. Smith for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Carver W. Wolfe for the petitioners.

O'Gorman and Young, Inc.,
Appellant,
458 vs.
Hartford Fire Insurance Company of Hartford, Connecticut;
O'Gorman and Young, Inc.,
Appellant,
459 vs.
Phoenix Assurance Company, Ltd., of London.

These cases were argued by Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt for the appellant, and by Mr. Ralph E. Lum for the appellees. Leave was granted counsel for both sides to file briefs on the legislative history bearing on the questions involved within five days from this date.

New Orleans Public Service, Inc.,
Appellant,
460 vs.
City of New Orleans.

This case was argued by Mr. Al C. Mammer for the appellant, and by Mr. Francis P. Burns and Mr. W. F. Conkerton for the appellee.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
462 vs.
David A. Reed.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elton L. Marshall, It is ordered that John M. Hadley, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elton L. Marshall, It is ordered that John C. Grover, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred H. Davis, It is ordered that George L. Rutherford, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Boyle, Jr., It is ordered that Bruce K. Brown, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton Strosburger, It is ordered that Jacob Burns, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, It is ordered that Edwin C. Hollins, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Carter, It is ordered that Monroe M. Friedman, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that Johnst Northcutt, Esquire, of Covington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred S. Purnell, It is ordered that Albert H. Cole, Esquire, of Peru, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton C. Carber, It is ordered that James B. Cullison, Jr., Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

462 vs.

David A. Reed.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Maynard Teall for the respondent.

Brinkerhoff-Faris Trust & Savings Company, Petitioner, 464 vs. Walter O. Hill, Treasurer, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Roy C. Rucker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lieutellus Cunningham for the respondent.
Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners, 469 vs. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. H. Tallichet for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Donald R. Richberg for the respondents.

FRIDAY, MAY 2, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank L. Hatch, It is ordered that David Durward Madden, Esquire, of Rockford, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Carter, It is ordered that Bernard Silverstein, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank L. Hatch, It is ordered that Thomas E. Gill, Esquire, of Rockford, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert S. Lisenby, It is ordered that Thomas J. Reilly, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles J. Hackman, It is ordered that Turner K. Hackman, Esquire, of Twin Falls, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Franklin W. Fort, It is ordered that Fred W. DeCamp, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Joseph L. Hurley, Esquire, of Fall River, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, it is ordered that George M. Lipman, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
469 vs.
Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Donald R. Richberg for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. John H. Crooker for the respondents.

Broad River Power Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
528 vs.
State of South Carolina, ex rel. John M. Daniel, Attorney General.

This case was argued by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt for the petitioners, and by Mr. Gordie Page and Mr. Irvine F. Belser for the respondent.

Barker Painting Company,

Petitioner,

477 vs.

Local No. 734, Brotherhood of Painters, etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Merritt Lane for the petitioner, and by Mr. Morris Hillquit for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MAY 5, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Urban C. Stover, It is ordered that Elmer D. Hays, Esquire, of Winchester, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul D. Miller, It is ordered that Benjamin I. Sperling, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon H. Rifkin, It is ordered that Samuel Backlar, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Zach Spearing, It is ordered that Charles E. Dunbar, Jr., Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar Bronson Tolman, It is ordered that Richard Bentley, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar Bronson Tolman, It is ordered that Charles P. Megan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Thomas Boylan, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duane R. Dills, It is ordered that Eugene E. Heaton, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duane R. Dills, It is ordered that Berthold Muecke, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duane R. Dills, It is ordered that George P. Hatch, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton L. French, It is ordered that Raymond L. Givens, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry W. Van Dyke, It is ordered that John Shaw Field, Esquire, of Reno, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Barham R. Gary, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, It is ordered that George A. DeCottes, Esquire, of Sanford, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, It is ordered that Richard G. Key, Esquire, of St. Petersburg, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Home Insurance Company and Franklin
Fire Insurance Company,
Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the
232 vs. State of Texas.
C. J. Dick, Texas & Gulf Steamship
Company, and Suderman & Young, Inc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Home Insurance Company and
Franklin Fire Insurance Company, Petitioners,
232 vs.
C. J. Dick, Texas & Gulf Steamship Company, and Suderman & Young, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Company, Petitioner,
389 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the decision or consideration of this case.

Ike Danovitz, Surviving Partner of
Feitler Bottle Company, Claimants,
Petitioner,
424 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

William A. Sherman, M. F. Cochran and J. B. Sanford, Constituting the Board of State Harbor Commissioners of the State of California, et al.,
486 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for a writ of certiorari to bring up the entire record and cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
642 vs.
The United States of America, et al.
The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
643 vs.
The Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Railway Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes,
It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases assigned for argument on Monday, October 20th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank L. Smith, et al.,
Appellants,
845 vs.
Illinois Bell Telephone Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 20th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
462 vs.
David A. Reed.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United StatesCircuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

L. B. Ivey, W. H. Taylor, Ed Harrison, et al;,
Appellants,
670 vs.
J. R. Keeling, A. D. Boozer, J. J. Stewart, et al.

Appeal from the Court of Civil Appeals, Eleventh Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Eleventh Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

O. W. Holmes,

Appellant,

674 vs.

City of Fayetteville.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Interstate Commerce Commission,

Petitioner,

768 vs.

Northern Pacific Railroad Company, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Miller Brothers Company,

Petitioner,

772 vs.

Lektophone Corporation.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
800 vs.
Anthony La Franca.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Annette Aiken, Administrator of the estate of Friend M. Aiken, deceased,
Petitioner,
777 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted, the argument to be limited to the questions concerning the validity and effect of the waivers.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank Morris,
Petitioner,
734 vs.
Royal Indemnity Company, a corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lehigh & Hudson River Railway Company,

Petitioner,

742 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company,

Petitioner,

743 vs.

Roberta Harper Coffey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Florence B. Laws,

Petitioner,

744 vs.

Eleanor Bradford Davis, Blanche L. Bradford, Hannah B. Neff, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Ball,

Petitioner,

745 vs.

Western Marine and Salvage Company, a corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Catherine V. Massey, Elizabeth Massey, Nellie L. Massey, et al.,

Petitioners,

747 vs.

The Miller Rubber Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alan Kissock,

Petitioner,

748 vs.

Duquesne Steel Foundry Company and Molybdenum Corporation of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jessie Margaret Budlong,
Petitioner,
749 vs.
Milton J. Budlong.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court for the County of Newport, State of Rhode Island.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court for the County of Newport, State of Rhode Island, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wrightsville & Tennille Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
751 vs.
The Citizens & Southern National Bank, and H. W. Whitman, Receiver of First National Bank of Dublin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George T. Robinson, Trustee for Mortgage Bondholders,
Petitioner,
752 vs.
S. E. Dickey, Trustee in Bankruptcy.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Herkimer National Bank,
Petitioner,
762 vs.
A. Grant Blue, as Trustee in Bankruptcy
of Charles W. Tryon, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George A. Bew,
Petitioner,
694 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Emil Hansen, Permanent Receiver of
Syracuse Sand Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
758 vs.
E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles F. Silva,
Petitioner,
759 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Mutual Liability Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
769 vs.
W. H. McCaffrey, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louisiana Oil Refining Corporation,
Petitioner,
773 vs.
Harry L. Reed, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William W. Wheelock and William G. Bierd, Receivers of the Chicago & Alton Railroad Company, Petitioners,

776 vs.

Dora E. Norton, Administratrix of the Estate of John Henry Norton, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lillie B. Thompson, et al., Petitioners,

778 vs.

Houston Oil Company of Texas, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank Guile, et al., Petitioners,

779 vs.

E. M. Statler, as Owner of the vessel "Miramar", etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry Escher, Ancillary Administrator
of Jak. Robert Sigg-Fehr, Deceased,
et al.,
Petitioners,
697 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southwest Power Company,
Petitioner,
723 vs.
Ruth Ann Price, Administratrix of the estate of Henry Clay Price, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

O R D E R.

The Court will take a recess from to-day until Monday, May 19; from that day until Monday, May 26, and from that day until Monday, June 2, upon which day it will adjourn for the term.

Mortgage Guarantee Company, Petitioner,
811 vs.
Galen H. Welch, United States Collector, etc.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Martin Conboy, leave was granted to file brief of New York Title and Mortgage Company and others as amici curiae, in this cause.

The City of New York, Petitioner,
867 vs.
Cranford Company.

On consideration of the motion in behalf of counsel for petitioner for leave to file reply brief within one week,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

B. K. Isaacs, as Trustee, etc.,
795 vs.
Hobbs Tie & Timber Company.

The motion for a writ of certiorari herein to bring up the entire record and cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Reilly in behalf of counsel for B. K. Isaacs, Trustee.

The State of Louisiana, Complainant,
9, Original. vs.
The State of Mississippi.

The report of Thomas G. Haight, as special master herein, was presented to the consideration of the Court.

Commonwealth of Kentucky, Complainant,
16, Original. vs.
State of Indiana, et al.

The proposed form of decree pursuant to the opinion of this Court announced April 14, 1930, was submitted by Mr. J. W. Cammack and Mr. Clifford E. Smith for the complainant and by Mr. James M. Ogden and Mr. Connor D. Ross for defendant, State of Indiana.

Florence B. Laws,
Appellant,
744 vs.
Eleanor Bradford Davis, et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Weld Peck for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. Walter A. DeCamp for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Ella Guivarch, et al.,
Petitioners,
864 vs.
Maryland Casualty Company.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William B. Harrell for the petitioners.

Southwest Power Company,
Appellant,
723 vs.
Ruth Ann Price, Administratrix, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. McDonough and Mr. Frank M. Kemp for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. W. H. Fuller, Mr. George M. Porter, and Mr. Harry P. Warner, for the appellees in opposition thereto.

City of Richmond, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
729 vs.
J. B. Deans.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James E. Cannon for the appellants.

Florence B. Laws,
Appellants,
744 vs.
Eleanor Bradford Davis, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter A. DeCamp for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. John Weld Peck for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Percival E. Magee, Petitioner,

761 vs.

The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore B. Benson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Lisle A. Smith for the respondent.

Guaranty Trust Company of New York, as Trustee, Petitioner,

764 vs.

The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company, et al.;

William P. Hawley, et al., Petitioner,

765 vs.

The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company, et al.;

The New York Trust Company, as Trustee, etc., Petitioner,

826 vs.

The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company, et al.;

The Bennett Committee, etc. Petitioner,

827 vs.

The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company, et al.;

Bankers Trust Company, as Trustee, Petitioner,

828 vs.

The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company, et al.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, Mr. Edwin S. S. Sunderland, Mr. Warren S. Carter, and Mr. Thomas O'G. FitzGibbon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry W. Taft, Mr. Paxton Blair, Mr. Alfred A. Cook, Mr. Frederick F. Greenman, Mr. Henry V. Poor, and Mr. Frederick G. Ingersoll for the respondents in No. 764; by Mr. John Junell, for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent, the United States of America, in No. 765; by Mr. Joseph M. Hartfield and Mr. Jesse E. Wald for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry W. Taft, Mr. Paxton Blair, Mr. Alfred A. Cook, Mr. Frederick F. Greenman, Mr. Henry V. Poor, and Mr. Frederick G. Ingersoll for the respondents, in No. 826; by Mr. Joseph M. Hartfield and Mr. Jesse E. Wald, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred A. Cook, Mr. Frederick F. Greenman, Mr. Henry W. Taft, and Mr. Paxton Blair for the respondents, in No. 827; by Mr. Charles Bunn and Mr. James H. McIntosh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred A. Cook, Mr. Frederick F. Greenman, Mr. Henry W. Taft, Mr. Paxton Blair, Mr. Henry V. Poor, and Mr. Frederick G. Ingersoll for the respondents, in No. 828.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
785 vs.
Albert B. Fall.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Atlee Pomerene and Mr. Owen J. Roberts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark B. Thompson, Mr. William E. Leahy, Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, and Mr. Frank J. Hogan for the respondent.

Commercial Casualty Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
786 vs.
A. S. Williams, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allan C. Rowe for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Roundtree for the respondent.

Leo J. Falk, as Executor, etc.,
Petitioner,
788 vs.
State of Idaho, et al.;
Leo J. Falk and Ralph Falk,
Executors, etc.,
Petitioners,
789 vs.
State of Idaho, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M. Kahn for the petitioners, and by Mr. W. D. Gillis and Mr. Leon M. Fish for the respondents.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
790 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James E. Lyons and Mr. Harry H. McElroy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur T. George for the respondent.

Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner,
791 vs.
Geo. H. Croley Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Railroad Commission of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James E. Lyons and Mr. Harry H. McElroy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Marcel E. Cerf for the respondent.

Michael Adam,
Petitioner,
792 vs.
The New York Trust Company, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Michael Adam, pro se.

Allen F. Coulter, et al.,
Petitioners,
794 vs.
Eagle & Phenix Mills.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney and Mr. Henry D. Gaggstatter for the petitioners.

Commercial Union Assurance Company of London, Ltd.,
Petitioner,
804 vs.
Samuel Jass, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. A. Hammond and Mr. Haines H. Hargrett for the petitioner.

Thomas Murphy,
Petitioner,
806 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Levi Cooke for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Hal Thompson, as Receiver, et al., etc.
Petitioners,
807 vs.
Otis Elevator Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel MacDougald for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edwin W. Sims, Mr. Elwood O. Godman, and Mr. Martin H. Long for the respondent.

The Tin Decorating Company of Baltimore,
Petitioner,
808 vs.
Metal Package Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. J. Johnston, Mr. J. Granville Meyers, and Mr. Charles J. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Houston Kenyon, Mr. Theodore S. Kenyon, and Mr. Frederick B. Townsend for the respondent.

Hannah M. Smith, Administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
809 vs.
Magic City Kennel Club, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb for the petitioner.

Marshall L. Mott,
Petitioner,
810 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles B. Rogers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Nat M. Lacy, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Mortgage Guarantee Company,
Petitioner,
811 vs.
Galen H. Welch, United States Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph W. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Barham R. Gary, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
812 vs.
Theodore Michel;
The United States of America,
Petitioner,
813 vs.
Louis Krieger.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. Barham R. Gary for the petitioner, and by Mr. Donald Horne for the respondents.

Henry Choteau,
Petitioner,
815 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James H. Maxey, Mr. T. J. Leahy, and Mr. C. S. MacDonald for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Morton Poe Fisher for the respondent.

Mrs. Amarillis D. Pettit, Petitioner,
816 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James H. Maxey, Mr. T. J. Leahy, and Mr. C. S. MacDonald for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Morton Poe Fisher for the respondent.

United States Navigation Company, Inc., Petitioner,
825 vs.
The Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mark W. Maclay, Mr. Goldthwaite H. Dorr, and Mr. John Tilney Carpenter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondents.

Graham-Brown Shoe Company, et al., Petitioner,
849 vs.
J. J. Holliday, alleged trustee, etc. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lee Cammage Carter for the petitioners.

The City of New York, Petitioner,
867 vs.
Cranford Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly and Mr. J. Joseph Lilly for the petitioner, and by Mr. Franklin Nevius, Mr. Asa B. Kellogg, and Mr. Harvey D. Jacob for the respondent.

Helen M. Slemp, Appellant,
490 vs.
City of Tulsa, a municipal corporation, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Richard K. Bridges for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Fried, It is ordered that Lester L. Siegel, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Fried, It is ordered that Milford H. Clark, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Ristine, It is ordered that Donald V. Hunter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Ristine, It is ordered that Frederick Oliver Graves, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, It is ordered that William H. Foulk, Esquire, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, It is ordered that Clarence A. Southerland, Esquire, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry C. Hall, It is ordered that Harris H. Gilman, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ewin L. Davis, It is ordered that Louis T. Ferguson, Esquire, of Manchester, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Talma L. Smith, It is ordered that John H. Cannon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman J. Galloway, It is ordered that George O. Dix, Esquire, of Terre Haute, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Madison L. Hill, It is ordered that Max Pomerantz, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Pedro Guevara, It is ordered that Jose C. Abreu, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jed Johnson, It is ordered that Eugene Jordan, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Pedro Guevara, It is ordered that Manuel C. Briones, Esquire, of Cebu, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ewin L. Davis, It is ordered that Ewing Clouse, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Pedro Guevara, It is ordered that Marcelo T. Boncan, Esquire, of Manila, Philippine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Waterman, It is ordered that C. W. Dolph, Esquire, of Colorado Springs, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal C. Johnson, It is ordered that Clyde M. Candy, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Christopherson, It is ordered that Lewis L. Walker, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert A. Green, It is ordered that Robert S. Florence, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert A. Green, It is ordered that Frank F. L'Engle, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby, It is ordered that John B. Marsh, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tasker L. Oddie, It is ordered that George F. Talbot, Esquire, of Reno, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert A. Green, It is ordered that J. V. Walton, Esquire, of Palatka, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman J. Galloway, It is ordered that Harold A. Henderson, Esquire, of Saint Augustine, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Kerr, It is ordered that Thomas R. Winter, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis F. Glenn, It is ordered that Thomas J. Welch, Jr., Esquire, of Kewanee, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charter Shipping Company, Ltd., Petitioner, vs. Bowring, Jones & Tidy, Ltd.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

397

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and on motion to dismiss the writ of certiorari, which was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, Sued in the Name of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation,

Petitioner,

345 vs.

P. Leroy Harwood, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Groton Iron Works, and Isaac Siegel and John M. P. Thatcher, as Ancillary Receivers of United States Steamship Co., Intervenors.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Richbourg Motor Company, Intervenor,

Petitioner,

452 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Davies Motors, Inc., Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

569

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Broad River Power Company, Columbia Railway, Gas and Electric Company, and F. D. Campbell, Petitioners, vs. State of South Carolina ex rel. John M. Daniel, Attorney General. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

528

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Georgia Power Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
City of Decatur.

363

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Western Cartridge Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
Louis L. Emmerson, Secretary of State of the State of Illinois.

375

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
vs.
Nelson B. Updike, et al.

340

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

James E. Tyler, Jr., and William G. Tyler, Administrators of the Estate of James E. Tyler,

Petitioners,

428 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

546 vs.

Provident Trust Company of Pennsylvania and Charles Sinkler, Administrators, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

547 vs.

Girard Trust Company and Joseph L. Woolston, Executors, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company,

Appellant,

680 vs.

The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, The Wheeling & Lake Erie Railway Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed without prejudice to the right, if any, of the Pittsburgh & West Virginia Railway Company to enjoin in a proper proceeding action by the Wheeling & Lake Erie Railway Company.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Federal Radio Commission,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

122 vs. Court of Appeals of the

General Electric Company and People District of Columbia.

of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Mr. Chief Justice Hughes did not participate in the consideration or decision of this case.

J. P. Grubb, a natural person,

Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of the

491 vs. United States for the Southern

The Public Utilities Commission of District of Ohio.

Ohio, Columbus, Ohio, The Interstate

Motor Transit Company, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the statement as to jurisdiction, motion by counsel for the appellees to dismiss the appeal in this cause or to affirm the decree of the lower court, and brief opposing said motion;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered that the motion to affirm in this cause be, and the same is hereby, sustained.

Therefore, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Edward Eliason and Elin Eliason,

Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

347 vs. State of Illinois.

Charles Wilborn, Carrie Wilborn, and

Noel State Bank.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Barker Painting Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the United

477 vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for

Local No. 734, Brotherhood of Painters, the Third Circuit.

Decorators, and Paper-hangers of

America, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of North Dakota, C. W. McDonnell, Fay Harding, et al., etc., Appellants,

364 vs.

Great Northern Railway Company, Northern Pacific Railway Company, Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of North Dakota with direction to dismiss the bill of complaint.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, etc., and Farmers Union Co-operative Gin Company, Appellants,

454 vs.

William Lowe, Doing Business Under the Trade Name of Capitol Hill Gin Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma with direction to dismiss the bill of complaint.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The City of Cincinnati,
Petitioner,
372 vs.
Margaret W. Vester.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The City of Cincinnati,
Petitioner,
373 vs.
James S. Richards and Paschel L. Richards.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The City of Cincinnati, Petitioner, vs. Llewellyn B. Reakirt. 374

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mari Tollefsen Todok and Knut C. Engen, Petitioners, vs. Union State Bank of Harvard, Nebraska, a Corporation; Leroy A. Megrue, et al. 412

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of Louisiana,	Complainant,	It is now here ordered that the Report of the Special Master in this cause be filed, and the parties may file exceptions or objections, if any, thereto on or before Monday, October 6th, next.
9, Original.	vs.	
The State of Mississippi.		

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,	Complainant,	The Commonwealth of Kentucky and the State of Indiana having submitted a form of decree to carry into effect the conclusions of this Court as stated in its opinion delivered April 14,
16, Original.	vs.	
State of Indiana, et al.		

1930 (281 U. S. —), with the request that the form so submitted be approved by the Court, the Court hereby enters the decree in this form as follows:

D E C R E E.

This cause came on to be heard upon the pleadings, stipulation of facts, and briefs and was argued by counsel. The Court now being fully advised in the premises, and for the purpose of carrying into effect the conclusion set forth in the opinion of this Court announced April 14, 1930,(— U. S. —).

It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed as follows:

1. That the bill of complaint as amended be, and it hereby is, dismissed as against the individual defendants, James Duane Duncan, Claude F. Johnson, Walter L. Brandt, Robert N. Losey, Frank H. Hatfield, Todd Stoops, John F. Carson, Robert E. Rogers, and Lester R. McCool.

2. That the defendant, the State of Indiana, and each of its officers, agents, and servants, and all persons assuming to act under authority of either of them, be, and they hereby are, enjoined from delaying, attempting to delay, failing or refusing to promptly and in good faith perform or cause to be performed the covenants, on the part of the State of Indiana to be performed, of the agreement made and entered into by and between the Commonwealth of Kentucky, through and by the State Highway Commission of Kentucky, and the State of Indiana, through and by the Indiana State Highway Commission, of date September 12, 1928, which provides for the construction by the State of Indiana of a bridge across the Ohio River between Evansville, Indiana, and Henderson, Kentucky, at the point designated in the plans and specifications referred to in said contract.

3. That the defendant, the State of Indiana, its officers, agents, servants, and all persons assuming to act under the authority of either of them, be, and they hereby are, directed to immediately resume, in good faith, the performance of each and all of the covenants of said contract, on its part to be performed, according to its terms, and to continue the performance thereof until each and all of said covenants shall have been fully performed.

4. That the defendant, the State of Indiana, through and by its State Highway Commission, shall proceed at once with the completion of the plans and specifications for said bridge, and shall advertise and let a contract or contracts for the construction thereof as soon as practicable after the Commonwealth of Kentucky shall have made permanently available sufficient funds to pay its part of the cost of said bridge as provided in said contract, of date September 12, 1928. The said Indiana State Highway Commission hereby is expressly directed to act and proceed for and on behalf of the State of Indiana in promptly and expeditiously complying with the terms of this decree.

5. That the defendant, the State of Indiana, by and through its State Highway Commission, shall file with the Clerk of this Court semi-annually on September 1st and March 1st of each year, beginning September 1, 1930, a report to this Court adequately setting forth the progress made in the construction of said bridge and in the performance of the covenants of said contract on the part of the State of Indiana to be performed, during the period from the entry of this decree down to the date of such report.

6. That the complainant, Commonwealth of Kentucky, may, irrespective of the filing of the described reports, apply to this Court for any further action or relief, and this Court retains jurisdiction of the above entitled suit for the purpose of any order or direction, or modification of this decree, or any supplemental decree, which it may deem at any time to be proper in relation to the subject matter in controversy.

And it is further ordered that the costs in this case shall be taxable one-half against the State of Indiana and one-half against the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Florence B. Laws,

Appellant,

744 vs.

Eleanor Bradford Davis, Blanche L. Bradford, Hannah B. Neff, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ella Guivarch and Billy Guivarch,

Petitioners,

864 vs.

Maryland Casualty Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ella Guivarch and Billy Guivarch,

Petitioners,

864 vs.

Maryland Casualty Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

B. K. Isaacs, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Henrietta E. Cunningham, Bankrupt,

795 vs.

Hobbs Tie & Timber Company.

On consideration of the motion for a writ of certiorari to bring up the entire record and cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Helen M. Slemp,

Appellant,

490 vs.

City of Tulsa, a Municipal Corporation, and the Park Board of said City of Tulsa and Albert H. Bell, et al., etc.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Helen M. Slemp,

Petitioner,

490 vs.

City of Tulsa, a Municipal Corporation, and the Park Board of Said City of Tulsa and Albert H. Bell, et al., etc.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southwest Power Company,

Appellant,

723 vs.

Ruth Ann Price, Administratrix of the Estate of Henry Clay Price, Deceased.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

City of Richmond, a Municipal Corporation; J. Fulmer Bright, et al.,

Appellants,

729 vs.

J. B. Deans.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Percival E. Magee,

Petitioner,

761 vs.

The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted, the briefs and argument to be limited to the question of the effect and validity of Sec. 611, Revenue Act, 1928. It is also ordered that this case be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument immediately following No. 589, Graham, et al., vs. Goodcell, Former Collector.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hannah M. Smith, Administratrix of the Estate of Owen P. Smith, Deceased.
Petitioner,
809 vs.
Magic City Kennel Club, Inc., and John J. Shaughnessy.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Marshall L. Mott,
Petitioner,
810 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
812 vs.
Theodore Michel.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
813 vs.
Louis Krieger.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry Choteau, Petitioner,
815 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mann Carter and Will Carter, Petitioners,
766 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mann Carter and Will Carter, Petitioners,
767 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph Riesenman, Sr., individually, and Joseph Riesenman and John C. Brecht, doing business as R. & B. Motor Company, Petitioners,
774 vs.
John L. Nesbit, James McElhinney, Elzora Thompson, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hattie B. Wilson, as Administratrix of the Estate of William M. Wilson, deceased, Petitioner,
775 vs.
Lehigh Valley Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Odil Labbee, Petitioner, vs. Thavenot Steamship Company. 781 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Indianapolis Union Railway Company, The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. Cincinnati, Indianapolis & Western Railroad Company. 782 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Indianapolis Union Railway Company, the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. Cincinnati, Indianapolis & Western Railroad Company. 783 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Martin Reider,
Petitioner,
784 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ely & Walker Dry Goods Company,
Petitioner,
787 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Douglas F. Fesler,
Petitioner,
793 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John M. Wright, as County Treasurer of Shawnee County, Kansas, et al., Petitioners, vs. The Central National Bank of Topeka, Kansas.

797 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Blackburn Construction Company, a co-partnership composed of W. A. Ward and Dan Blackburn, Petitioner, vs. The Cedar Rapids National Bank, a corporation.

798 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. W. A. Aaron.

801 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, 6th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 6th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Twin City Water Softener Company,
Northwest Chemical Company and
Emmett J. Culligan,
Petitioners,
802 vs.
American Doucil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Guaranty Trust Company of New York,
as Trustee,
Petitioner,
764 vs.
The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad
Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William P. Hawley, Mark W. Potter and
William J. Wollman,
Petitioners,
765 vs.
The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad
Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The New York Trust Company, as Trustee of the First Consolidated Mortgage of The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company, et al.

826 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Bennett Committee, representing the bondholders under the First Mortgage of The Des Moines and Fort Dodge Railroad Co., Petitioner, vs. The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company, et al.

827 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bankers Trust Company, as Trustee, Petitioner, vs. The Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad Company, et al.

828 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
785 vs.
Albert B. Fall.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commercial Casualty Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
786 vs.
A. S. Williams, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Walter Clark.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Leo J. Falk, as Executor of the Estate of Samuel Marx Rothchild, deceased,
Petitioner,
788 vs.
State of Idaho, Ada County, Idaho.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Leo J. Falk and Ralph Falk, Executors of the Estate of Anne Falk Rothchild, deceased,
Petitioners,
789 vs.
State of Idaho, Ada County, Idaho.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
790 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
791 vs.
Geo. H. Croley Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Railroad Commission of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Railroad Commission of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Allen F. Coulter, R. L. Duke, H. C. McCutchen, et al., Petitioners, vs. Eagle & Phenix Mills. 794

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commercial Union Assurance Company of London, Ltd., Petitioner, vs. Samuel Jass and Moses L. Jass, Partners, Trading as Jass Manufacturing Company. 804

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thomas Murphy, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 806

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hal Thompson, as Receiver, and John B. Wheat, as Trustee,
Petitioners,
807 vs.
Otis Elevator Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Tin Decorating Company of Baltimore,
Petitioner,
808 vs.
Metal Package Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mortgage Guarantee Company,
Petitioner,
811 vs.
Galen H. Welch, United States Collector of Internal Revenue, Sixth District of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Amarillis D. Pettit,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

816 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Navigation Company, Inc.,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

825 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

The Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd., of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Oceanic Steam Navigation Company, Ltd.,

Furness Withy & Company, Ltd., et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Graham-Brown Shoe Company, et al.,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

849 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

J. J. Holliday, alleged trustee of the of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

estate of Leader Mercantile Co.,

bankrupt, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The City of New York,
Petitioner,
867 vs.
Cranford Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
370 vs.
Western Meat Company, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, counsel for the petitioner in this case, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause and to issue the mandate forthwith, each party to pay its own costs in this Court;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, each party to pay its own costs in this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Burns Poe, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Washington,
492 vs.
H. C. Seaborn.

The joint motion for a writ of certiorari to bring up the entire record and cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in that behalf.

Fred O. Goodell, Collector, etc.,
882 vs.
I. B. Koch.

The joint motion for a writ of certiorari to bring up the entire record and cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in that behalf.

Burns Poe, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
492 vs.
H. C. Seaborn;
George C. Hopkins, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
821 vs.
C. W. Bacon;
Jacob O. Bender, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
823 vs.
William Pfaff;
Fred O. Goodell, Collector of Internal Revenue,
882 vs.
I. B. Koch.

The motion to advance these cases for hearing in sequence was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in that behalf.

Consuelo Cabangis, etc., et al., Petitioners,
848 vs.
The Government of the Philippine Islands.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Pedro Guevara for the petitioners, leave was granted petitioners to file additional brief within two days, with leave to the respondent to reply thereto on or before Friday next, on motion of Mr. William C. Rigby for the respondent.

C. A. Jungst, E. H. Whitney and Bertha Kinney,
Appellants,
780 vs.
H. C. Baldridge, Governor of the State of Idaho, W. D. Gillis, Attorney General, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the appellants for leave to file out of time statement as to jurisdiction in this cause;
It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Interstate Commerce Commission,
Petitioner,
768 vs.
Northern Pacific Railroad Company, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. M. Reidy for the petitioner.

Daniel P. O'Connell,
Petitioner,
844 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert for the petitioner, leave was granted the petitioner to file reply brief on or before Friday next.

The Clerk submitted the following reports:

To the Honorable,

The Supreme Court of the United States.

REPORT OF THE CLERK OF ACTION TAKEN UNDER THE ORDER OF THE COURT DATED JUNE 3, 1929.

Pursuant to the order of this Court dated June 3, 1929, further report is respectfully submitted to the Court regarding the collection and disposal of costs in the cases of State of North Carolina vs. State of Tennessee, No. 4, Original, October Term, 1916, and State of Louisiana vs. State of Mississippi, No. 11, Original, October Term, 1905.

As directed by said order effort to settle these cases was continued, the result of which, together with the recommendation of the Clerk in respect to one of the cases, are respectfully submitted to the Court as follows:

State of North Carolina vs. State of Tennessee.

No. 4, Original, October Term, 1916.

In this case payment of $3,428.97, the full amount due from the State of Tennessee, was received from Edgar J. Graham, Comptroller of that State, on September 25, 1929. This amount, together with a balance of $2,612.26 on deposit with the Clerk, showed a total sum of $6,041.23 credited in the case. Deducting therefrom the amount of Clerk's costs due, $1,055.20, the remaining balance of $4,986.03, representing settlement in full of the amount due to the State of North Carolina, was paid to the Treasurer of that State on October 3, 1929.

I have, therefore, to report this case as closed on the books of the Clerk.

State of Louisiana vs. State of Mississippi.

No. 11, Original, October Term, 1905.

In this case correspondence has been conducted with the proper State officers of the State of Mississippi in the continued effort to collect the sum of $5,694.70 due from that State. The State being without available funds with which to meet this obligation, it is necessary to resort to its Legislature for an appropriation of that sum of money before payment can be made. The Legislature of Mississippi convened on January 7, 1930. A bill was drafted and presented to it at the beginning of that session by the Attorney General of the

State, accompanied by his written request, addressed to the Appropriations Committee, urging passage of the bill at that session. (Copies of the bill and request were filed with the Clerk of this Court.)

Subsequently, inquiries have been addressed to the Attorney General who, from time to time, advised no action had been taken upon the bill. His latest communication upon this subject is a telegram received this day, (May 17th), which is quoted, as follows:

"Bill appropriating money pay costs case Louisiana versus Mississippi has not passed State Senate (stop) Legislature adjourns May seventeenth very doubtful whether bill can be passed (stop) Legislature meets again January nineteen thirty two.

J. A. Lauderdale, Assistant Attorney General."

As settlement of this case is dependent upon payment by the State of Mississippi of the amount due from it, and in anticipation that funds for such payment will ultimately be procured by legislation, to which end continued effort will be exerted, the Clerk respectfully recommends that the Court order a further extension of time, of sufficient duration, to permit him to continue his effort to settle this case.

Very respectfully,

May 17, 1930. Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

To the Honorable,

The Supreme Court of the United States:

SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT OF THE CLERK OF ACTION TAKEN UNDER THE ORDER OF THE COURT DATED JUNE 3, 1929.

In re: State of Louisiana v. State of Mississippi,

No. 11, Original, October Term, 1905.

The Report of the Clerk in relation to this case was dated May 17, 1930, and based upon information furnished by the Assistant Attorney General of Mississippi by telegram received upon that date, which telegram is quoted in that Report.

Subsequent inquire, addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, was answered by telegram received May 21, 1930, quoted as follows:

"Appropriation bill Louisiana versus Mississippi did not pass (stop) Bill will be reintroduced at January nineteen thirty-two session.

J. A. Lauderdale, Assistant Attorney General".

A letter was received from the Assistant Attorney General on May 23, 1930, quoted in part as follows:

"* * * * * * * * *

I will be more than glad to do what I can to get this bill re-introduced and passed at the next session of the Legislature.

This session of the Legislature has not yet finally adjourned, but a Concurrent Resolution has been passed, agreeing that no further legislation would be considered at this session. * * * * * *"

The Clerk, therefore, reports to the Court that it appears highly improbable that funds to pay costs due in this case will be available to the State of Mississippi prior to action by its Legislature at the January 1932, session.

In view of the assurance of the Attorney General's Office of the State of Mississippi that the bill will be re-introduced at the next session of the Legislature, the Clerk respectfully re-states his recommendation that the Court further extend the time, direct him to continue his effort to settle this case and make further report to the Court before the close of the October Term, 1931.

Very respectfully,

May 23, 1930. Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1929.

To the Honorable,

The Supreme Court of the United States:

REPORT OF THE CLERK RESPECTING COSTS NOT COLLECTED IN CERTAIN CASES DISPOSED OF IN THE OCTOBER TERM, 1928, AND PRIOR TERMS, AS SHOWN IN THE ANNUAL AUDIT OF THE CLERK'S ACCOUNTS, DATED OCTOBER 6, 1929.

Pursuant to the direction of the Court a report is respectfully presented respecting certain cases disposed of by the Court during the October Term, 1928, and prior terms, in which costs have not been collected, as indicated by the annual audit of the accounts of the Clerk, dated October 6, 1929.

The audit shows $2,424.53 as costs due the Clerk in 137 cases. Of this amount $683.16, representing the entire costs due in 36 of these cases and a portion of the costs due in 2 additional cases, has been collected.

In 33 (including the two partially collected) cases in which costs amounting to $678.25 are due and have not been collected, correspondence is still open and the success of efforts to make further collection seems probable.

In the remaining 68 cases diligent effort has been made to collect costs due without success. The information obtained or conditions indicated by this effort would seem to justify the Clerk in reporting the costs due in these cases, amounting to $1,063.12, as uncollectable. These cases fall within four general classifications. The following table shows the apportionment of the costs among these classifications and the terms in which they accrued:

1. Personal injury cases in which the corporation prevailed in this Court and the private party is without funds. (Costs accrued during October Terms, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, and 1928)	$200.05
2. Cases in which the losing party is a bankrupt, individual or corporation. (Costs accrued during October Terms, 1918, 1923, 1924, 1925, and 1927).	281.60
3. Criminal cases; deportation cases; or cases in which the party owing costs has no funds. (Costs accrued during October Terms, 1914, 1918, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, and 1927).	414.17
4. Cases in which counsel have died or removed; parties have died or removed and efforts to reach either, or their representatives, have failed. (Costs accrued during 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, and 1927 Terms).	167.30
	$1,063.12

The foregoing conditions in respect to the cases in which costs due have not been collected are respectfully reported to the Court with the recommendation that an order be entered by the Court directing the Clerk to further hold the 33 cases in which there appears probability to make collection of costs by continued effort, and that the order of the Court authorize the Clerk to charge off on his books the costs due in 68 cases, specified in the list attached to this report, in which costs are deemed uncollectable, without, however, interfering with the force and validity of the charges therein contained, if collection hereafter in any of these cases proves to be possible.

Very respectfully,

May 19, 1930. Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

COSTS AS TO WHICH EFFORT HAS BEEN MADE TO COLLECT
AND WHICH ARE DEEMED TO BE UNCOLLECTABLE.

October Term, 1914.

No. 296.	Carl Oliver vs. State of Texas	$ 15.30

October Term, 1918.

No. 148.	Gratiot County State Bank vs. Johnson, Trustee	144.15
197.	Lane, Secy. vs. Pueblo of Santa Rosa.	133.72
		277.87

October Term, 1922.

No. 33.	North Carolina R. R. Co. vs. Lee, Adm'x.	14.55
65.	Gaffney vs. Hoyt.	2.60
132.	Davis, Director General vs. Green.	12.30
202.	The United States vs. Bhagat Singh Thind.	10.40
366.	Campbell vs. State of North Carolina.	9.10
		48.95

October Term, 1923.

No. 20.	The United States vs. Walter	7.35
44.	Anderson, Warden vs. Corall	7.35
54.	American Railway Express Co. vs. Levee.	23.75
90.	Board of Trade of Chicago vs. Johnson, Trustee.	10.35
130.	Sanguinetti vs. The United States.	6.10
188.	Taubel-Scott-Kitzmiller Co. vs. Fox, Trustee.	14.00
238.	Liberty National Bank vs. Bear, Trustee	12.10
272.	Missouri Pacific R. R. Co. vs. Prude.	7.35
467.	Chastleton Corpn. vs. Sinclair, et al.	7.10
546.	Hodman, Marshal. vs. Pothier.	12.55
819.	Davis, Director General vs. Corona Coal Co.	7.60
842.	Suitow vs. Wissing, Trustee.	2.35
		117.95

October Term, 1924.

20.	White, Trustee vs. Stump.	10.55
44.	Davis, Agent vs. Henderson.	8.65
63.	Davis, Agent vs. O'Hara.	21.20
95.	Tod, Commr. of Immigration vs. Waldman.	55.30
120.	The United States vs. Dunn.	16.10
148.	Lancaster, et al., Receivers vs. McCarthy.	3.10
158.	The United States vs. Halliday.	15.25
168.	Missouri Pacific R. R. Co. vs. Stroud.	7.85
177.	Stein, etc., vs. Tip Top Baking Co.	6.60
191.	Meek vs. Centre County Banking Co.	20.14
192.	Dale vs. Centre County Banking Co.	11.89
193.	Breese vs. Centre County Banking Co.	11.87
250.	Yadkin Railroad Co. vs. Sigmon, Admx.	14.30
260.	Fulton Nat'l. Bank vs. Hoosier, et al., Receivers.	7.35
308.	Modern Woodmen of America vs. Mixer.	8.10
322.	North Carolina R. R. Co. vs. Story and King, Admx.	24.25
341.	The United States vs. Napoiello.	15.00
622.	Boardman, Sheriff vs. Egan.	12.05
1155.	Cox vs. State of Florida.	9.85
1156.	Bryant vs. State of Florida.	9.10
		288.50

October Term, 1925.		
36	Pere Marquette R. R. Co. v. United States (Amicus Curiae)	6.50
155	Lee, et al. vs. People of Illinois.	15.65
201	Morse vs. The United States.	11.05
223	Davis, Agent vs. Weiss, Admr.	9.85
268	C. M. and St. P. Ry. Co. vs. Coogan, Special Admx.	16.05
306	C. and O. Ry. Co. vs. Nixon, Admx.	10.10
504	Crone v. Snook, Warden.	13.60
760	Interstate Refineries vs. Kaw Boiler Works Co.	5.55
868	Lawrence vs. State of Arizona.	7.95
871	Boyd vs. Smythe, Judge, etc.	13.85
		110.15
October Term, 1926.		
223	Anastopoulos vs. Johnson, Commr.	11.15
247	Harvey vs. State of Louisiana.	26.25
435	Collins, Admx. vs. Erie R. R. Co.	8.05
437	Hart v. North.	8.20
652	Larkin vs. People of State of New York.	13.35
940	Anastaspoulos vs. Steger and Son Piano Mfg. Co.	2.30
		69.30
October Term, 1927.		
39	Gulf, Mobile and Northern R. R. Co. vs. Wells.	7.60
40	Marlin vs. Lewallen.	12.30
53	Gulf, Colorado and Santa Fe Ry. Co. vs. Moser, Admx.	9.30
58	B. and O. R. R. Co. vs. Goodman, Admx.	17.05
103	Jackson vs. Steamship "Archimedes," etc.	22.20
108	McNeely, Admx. vs. Mayor and Board, etc. of Natchez.	1.10
131	Mellon, Director General vs. Goodyear, Admr.	13.80
179	Gulf, Mobile and Northern R. R. Co. vs. Touchstone.	7.10
187	Fort Smith, Subiaco and Rock Island R. R. Co. vs. Moore, Admx.	15.05
500	Casey vs. The United States.	5.60
		111.10

October Term, 1928.

133 C. and O. Ry. Co. vs. Stapleton.	16.00
225 A. C. L. Ry. Co. vs. Driggers, Admx.	8.00
	24.00

SUMMARY OF COSTS DEEMED UNCOLLECTABLE.

October Term, 1914.	15.30
October Term, 1918.	277.87
October Term, 1922.	48.95
October Term, 1923.	117.95
October Term, 1924.	288.50
October Term, 1925.	110.15
October Term, 1926.	69.30
October Term, 1927.	111.10
October Term, 1928.	24.00
Total.	$1,063.12

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The report of Charles Bunn, Esquire, Special Master herein, was presented.

Pauline H. Sloman, individually, etc.,
Appellant,
753 vs.
Security Trust Company, Trustee.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William L. Carpenter and Mr. Thomas G. Long for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. George E. Brand for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Pauline H. Sloman, individually, etc.,
Appellant,
753 vs.
Security Trust Company, Trustee.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Brand for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. William L. Carpenter and Mr. Thomas G. Long for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

The Live Stock National Bank, etc.,
Petitioner,
652 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Robert Sherrod for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John Vaughn Groner, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

The Director of the Lands of The Philippine Islands,
Petitioner,
754 vs.
Pedro Villa-Abrille, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Cattron Rigby, Mr. A. R. Stallings, and Mr. Edward A. Kreger for the petitioner.

Newman, Saunders & Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
757 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bernhard Knollenberger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Miami Bank & Trust Company, etc.,
Petitioner,
814 vs.
Clara Karsten, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick M. Hudson and Mr. Garland M. McNutt for the petitioner.

C. O. Tingley & Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
818 vs.
The Badger Rubber Works.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Russell M. Everett and Mr. Harry B. Rook for the petitioners, and by Mr. Franklin C. Neal for the respondent.

William A. R. Laird, et al.,
Petitioners,
819 vs.
Rebecca Tully, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore J. Lamar and Mr. Douglas Arant for the petitioners, and by Mr. Needham A. Graham, Jr., for the respondents.

Geo. C. Hopkins, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
821 vs.
C. W. Bacon.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
822 vs.
Munson Steamship Line.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Charles H. Weston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank Lyon, Mr. Irving L. Evans, and Mr. W. Calvin Chesnut for the respondent.

Jacob O. Bender, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
823 vs.
William Pfaff.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner.

Willard C. Hill, Petitioner, 829 vs. Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue; William H. Plumer, Petitioner, 830 vs. Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert G. Dodge and Mr. Harold S. Davis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. John MacC. Hudson for the respondent.
Benny Silver, Petitioner, 834 vs. The State of Washington.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Sullivan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ewing Dean Colvin for the respondent.
Edwin C. Bennett, et al., Petitioners, 836 vs. United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ashby Williams for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Frank Staley, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondents.

Joseph C. Flowers,
Petitioner,
838 vs.
Positype Corporation of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis X. Busch for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. Randolph Hicks for the respondent.

Florida National Bank, et al.,
Petitioners,
839 vs.
A. J. Evans.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter A. Harris for the petitioners, and by Mr. John H. L. Smith for the respondent.

Western & Atlantic Railroad,
Petitioner,
840 vs.
Mrs. Josephine Lochridge,
Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall and Mr. Frank Slemons for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel D. Hewlett for the respondent.

Daniel P. O'Connell,
Petitioner,
844 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, Mr. David V. Cahill, and Mr. Neile F. Towner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Demetrius Philippides,
Petitioner,
847 vs.
Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas A. Kane for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry L. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Consuelo Cabangis, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
848 vs.
The Government of the Philippine Islands.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Pedro Guevara and Mr. Claro M. Recto for the petitioners, and by Mr. William Cattron Rigby, Mr. W. A. Graham, and Mr. Edward A. Kreger for the respondent.

Alfred C. Rausch, Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner,
850 vs.
The Commercial Travellers Mutual Accident Association of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, and Mr. James C. Jones, Jr., for the petitioners.

Charles J. Theard, Receiver, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
855 vs.
Isaac N. Bushong.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Carroll and Mr. Delvaille H. Theard for the petitioners, and by Mr. John D. Miller for the respondent.

District of Columbia,
Petitioner,
857 vs.
William H. Colts.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Bride, Mr. Robert E. Lynch, and Mr. Robert F. Reeder for the petitioner.

Will A. Jackson,
Petitioner,
861 vs.
J. Frank Norris, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Crandall Mackey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark McMahon and Mr. Gillis A. Johnson for the respondents.

City of Shreveport, et al.,
Petitioners,
875 vs.
Shreveport Railways Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Looney for the petitioners and by Mr. W. H. Armbrecht and Mr. A. B. Freyer for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, May 26 next, at

MONDAY, MAY 26, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Neale, It is ordered that Thomas B. Tuohy, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel J. Flickinger, It is ordered that William H. Parmelee, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul M. Segal, It is ordered that Matt Goldstein, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer R. Hendricks, It is ordered that Henry M. Hartmann, Esquire, of Trenton, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer R. Hendricks, It is ordered that Hobert Price, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Easby-Smith, It is ordered that Edward J. Boughton, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Eugene E. Angervine, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry T. Rainey, It is ordered that Carl B. Nusbaum, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert F. Bresee, It is ordered that Saul D. Herman, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Phillips, It is ordered that C. B. Green, Esquire, of Clarendon, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis L. Mohundro, It is ordered that Robert E. Lambert, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison T. Smith, It is ordered that C. Osmond Hyde, Esquire, of Downey, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Hickey, It is ordered that Robert E. Glasscott, Esquire, of Michigan City, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Riley J. Wilson, It is ordered that Clare C. Clark, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Conlon, it is ordered that Rush Maxwell Blodget, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that George L. Buland, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, it is ordered that W. E. Richardson, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Robert L. Sabin, Jr., Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, it is ordered that Chellis M. Carpenter, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Bethuel M. Webster, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic P. Lee, It is ordered that William C. Green, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, It is ordered that Harry Shulman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul M. Segal, It is ordered that Frederick Edward Dickerson, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Gabriel Toombs,

Appellant,

485 vs.

Citizens Bank of Waynesboro.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Inez M. Jamison, William H. Dykman, and Martin E. Goetzinger, Executrix and Executors of William A. Jamison, Deceased,

Petitioners,

390 vs.

Valentin Encarnacion.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, ~~and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of New York.~~

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Alpha Steamship Corporation, William H. A. Walker and Frank Daly, etc., Petitioners, vs. Robert Cain. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

457

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Alfred E. Norris. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

555

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed and the judgment of the District Court affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. James E. Farrar. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

732

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., James M. Doran, Commissioner of Prohibition of the United States, et al., Petitioners, vs. Galeno Chemical Company, Inc., Union Course Pharmacy, Inc., P. T. Chemical Company, et al., etc. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

443

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., James M. Doran, Commissioner of Prohibition of the United States, et al., Petitioners, vs. D. P. Paul and Company, Incorporated. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

444

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Maurice Campbell, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., and James M. Doran, Federal Prohibition Commissioner of the United States, Petitioners, vs. W. H. Long & Company, Incorporated. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

445

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

S. O. Wynne, Federal Prohibition Administrator for Eastern Pennsylvania, et al., 510 vs. Swanson Chemical Corporation. On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that Questions 1 and 4 must be answered in the negative, and that Question 3 must be answered in the affirmative. In view of the answer to the third question, the second question need not be answered.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

James M. Doran, Prohibition Commissioner of the United States, et al., 511 vs. Martin H. Casper, Trading as Delmar Manufacturing and Chemical Company. On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that Question 2 must be answered in the affirmative, and that Question 3 must be answered in the negative. Question 1 is not answered.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Thomas A. Baldwin, Thomas A. Baldwin,
Executor of the Will of Carrie Pool
Baldwin, et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error,

417 vs.

State of Missouri.

In Error to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of error in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Thomas A. Baldwin, Thomas A. Baldwin,
Executor of the Will of Carrie Pool
Baldwin, et al., etc.,
Plaintiffs in Error
and Appellants,

417 vs.

State of Missouri.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and on the return to the Rule to Show Cause which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes, with which Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Stone agree.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Stone, in which Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur.

Wheeler Lumber Bridge and Supply Company of Des Moines, Iowa,
15 vs.
The United States of America.

On a certificate from the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said Court of Claims.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Universal Battery Company,
Petitioner,
127 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for complete findings and such further proceedings as may be appropriate.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Vesta Battery Corporation,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

275 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Bassick Manufacturing Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

350 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for definite and complete findings and such further proceedings as may be appropriate.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

F. W. Stewart Manufacturing Corporation,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

351 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Gemco Manufacturing Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

352 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company, et al., On writ of certiorari to the United

Petitioners, States Circuit Court of Appeals for

469 vs. the Fifth Circuit.

Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice McReynolds did not hear the argument and took no part in the decision of this case.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

ORDER.

The report of the clerk of this Court, submitted May 19 last, in which it is shown that the collection of costs due from litigants, in the case of State of North Carolina v. State of Tennessee, No. 4, Original, October term, 1916, has been completed and the case closed on the books of the clerk, and that further efforts toward the collection of costs in the case of State of Louisiana v. State of Mississippi, No. 11, original, October term, 1905, await the action of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi upon an appropriation bill to be introduced at its next session in January, 1932, is approved; and the clerk is directed to make a further report, before the close of the October term, 1931, with respect to the collection of costs in the latter case.

ORDER.

The report of the clerk of this Court, submitted May 19 last with respect to costs in cases disposed of at prior terms as shown by the last annual audit of the clerk's accounts, is approved. The clerk is authorized and directed to charge off on his books costs which are deemed uncollectible in the amount of $1,063.12 due in 68 cases listed in his report. This order shall not be deemed to affect the force and validity of the charges against the litigants in these cases, if collection hereafter in any such case shall prove to be possible.

The clerk is directed to continue his efforts to collect the costs due in the 33 cases listed in this report in which collection seems possible.

The State of Connecticut, Complainant,

vs.

13, Original.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

ORDER.

It is now here ordered by the Court that the Report of the Special Master in this cause be filed, and the parties may file exceptions or objections, if any, thereto on or before Monday, October 6th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Burns Poe, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Washington,
492 vs.
H. G. Seaborn.

On consideration of the joint motion for a writ of certiorari to bring up the entire record and cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fred O. Goodell, Collector of Internal Revenue,
882 vs.
I. B. Koch.

On consideration of the joint motion for a writ of certiorari to bring up the entire record and cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Burns Poe, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Washington,
492 vs.
H. G. Seaborn.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, it is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 20th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fred O. Goodell, Collector of Internal Revenue,
882 vs.
I. B. Koch.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 20th next, immediately following No. 492, Poe, Collector of Internal Revenue vs. Seaborn.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Interstate Commerce Commission,
Petitioner,
768 vs.
Northern Pacific Railroad Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 20th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pauline H. Sloman, individually and as executrix of the estate of Eugene H. Sloman, deceased,
Appellant,
753 vs.
Security Trust Company, Trustee.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company,
Plaintiff in Error,
1 vs.
August E. Holmberg;
Francis Beidler II, et al.,
Plaintiffs in Error,
3 vs.
South Carolina Tax Commission;
Indian Motocycle Company,
16 vs.
United States of America;
The United States of America, et al.,
Appellants,
395 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Company;
O'Gorman & Young, Inc., Appellant,
458 vs.
Hartford Fire Insurance Company, etc.;
O'Gorman & Young, Inc., Appellant,
459 vs.
Phoenix Assurance Company, Ltd., of London.

It is now here ordered by this Court that these cases be, and the same are hereby, restored to the docket for reargument.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Geo. C. Hopkins, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
821 vs.
C. W. Bacon.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 20th next, immediately following case No. 882, Fred O. Goodell, Collector of Internal Revenue vs. I. B. Koch. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jacob O. Bender, Collector of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

823 vs.

William Pfaff.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 20th next, immediately following case No. 821, Hopkins, Collector of Internal Revenue vs. Bacon.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Michael Adam,

Petitioner,

792 vs.

The New York Trust Company, Trustee.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Director of the Lands of the Philippine Islands,

Petitioner,

754 vs.

Pedro Villa-Abrille, Eugenia Villa-Abrille, Luz Villa-Abrille, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
822 vs.
Munson Steamship Line.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Daniel P. O'Connell,
Petitioner,
844 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Demetrius Philippides,
Petitioner,
847 vs.
Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of New York.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

District of Columbia, Petitioner,
857 vs.
William H. Colts.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Live Stock National Bank, Sioux City, Iowa, a Corporation, Petitioner,
652 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Newman, Saunders & Co., Inc., Petitioner,
757 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Miami Bank & Trust Company, a Florida Corporation, as Trustee,
Petitioner,
814 vs.
Clara Karsten, joined by her husband, A. F. Karsten.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. O. Tingley & Company and William McCollum,
Petitioners,
818 vs.
The Badger Rubber Works.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William A. R. Laird, et al.,
Petitioners,
819 vs.
Rebecca Tully, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Willard C. Hill,

Petitioner,

829 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William H. Plumer,

Petitioner,

830 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Benny Silver,

Petitioner,

834 vs.

The State of Washington.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edwin C. Bennett, H. W. Sweet,
C. E. Ferguson, et al., Petitioners, vs. United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

836

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph C. Flowers, Petitioner, vs. Positype Corporation of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

838

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Florida National Bank, et al., Petitioners, vs. A. J. Evans. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

839

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Western & Atlantic Railroad, Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Josephine Lochridge, Administratrix. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

840

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Consuelo Cabangis, assisted by her husband Pedro Gil, et al., Petitioners, vs. The Government of the Philippine Islands. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

848

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alfred C. Rausch, Administrator of the Estate of Julius C. Rausch, deceased, Petitioner, vs. The Commercial Travelers Mutual Accident Association of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

850

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles J. Theard, Receiver and Trustee
of Castell Land and Harbor Company,
Inc., et al., On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioners, to the United States Circuit Court
855 vs. of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.
Isaac N. Bushong.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Will A. Jackson,
Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
861 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
J. Frank Norris, Sarah A. Vestal, of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.
Dan S. Lydick, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

City of Shreveport, et al., On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioners, to the United States Circuit Court
875 vs. of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.
Shreveport Railways Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Paramount Famous Lasky Corporation, et al., Appellants,
820 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the appellee.

The United States of America, Appellant,
856 vs.
First National Pictures, Inc., et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the appellant.

Angelo Marsiglia, etc., Petitioner,
947 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for leave to file brief for the respondent within three days,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Vermont, Complainant,
3, Original. vs.
The State of New Hampshire.

The motion for leave to file amendments to the bill of complaint per stipulation of counsel, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Warren R. Austin for the complainant.

Miller Brothers Company, Petitioner,
772 vs.
Lektophone Corporation.

The joint motion to advance this case for hearing with No. 520, Lektophone Corporation v. The Rolla Company, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr. for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Davis for the respondent.

The Pottstown Iron Company,
Petitioner,
892 vs.
The United States.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul F. Myers for the petitioner.

George B. Reedal and First National Bank of Phillips,
Appellants,
951 vs.
Brothertown Realty Corporation.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Frederick deC. Faust, counsel for the appellee having filed in open Court the following certificate, to-wit:

"United States of America

In Supreme Court of the United States.

Brothertown Realty Corporation,
Defendant in Error,

vs.

George B. Reedal and First National Bank of Phillips, a corporation,
Plaintiffs in Error.

STATE OF WISCONSIN)
) SS
DANE COUNTY)

I, A. A. McLeod, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, hereby certify that the above entitled action is an action by the above named defendant in error against said plaintiffs in error to quiet title to certain land in Wisconsin in which the trial court in Wisconsin rendered judgment dismissing the complaint, and the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, on the 4th day of December, 1929, reversed the judgment of the court below and ordered judgment in favor of the defendant in error here. A motion for rehearing was duly denied on the 4th day of February, 1930.

On the 15th day of February, 1930, the above named plaintiffs in error filed a petition for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which appeal was duly allowed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin on said day, and on March 5, 1930, said Chief Justice duly signed and issued a citation to the defendant in error to appear herein before the Supreme Court

of the United States within thirty days from said date, pursuant to which petition, allowance and citation, a certified copy of said record was duly transmitted to the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States on the 13th day of March, 1930. This certificate is made at the request of the above named defendant in error and pursuant to Rule 10 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said court this 16th day of May, 1930, at Madison, Wisconsin.

(Signed) Arthur A. McLeod

(SEAL) Clerk of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin."

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the eleventh rule.

And it appearing to the Court that the appellants have failed to have their cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James Verner Scaife,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

755 vs. State of Pennsylvania.

Mary Magee Scaife.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the appellant have filed a motion to dismiss the appeal in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary C. McKee, Isabella C. Chalfant, and Eleanor McC. Chalfant, Appellants, vs. Mary Magee Scaife. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

756

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the appellants have filed a motion to dismiss the appeal in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John W. Gamble, Appellant, vs. Herbert S. Daniel, Receiver.

852

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur F. Mullen and Mr. Paul L. Martin for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Francis A. Brogan, Mr. C. A. Sorensen, and Mr. Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., for the appellant, in opposition thereto.

P. G. Fullerton, Appellant, vs. The State of Oklahoma ex rel. The Commissioners of the Land Office, etc.

760

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. G. Fullerton pro se, in support thereof, and by Mr. George E. Merritt, in opposition thereto.

Northport Power & Light Company, Appellant, vs. Roland H. Hartley, as Governor, etc. et al.

763

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. C. Moore and Mr. W. Lon Johnson for the appellant.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Appellant, vs. United States of America, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert Fitzpatrick and Mr. Robert B. Tunstall for the appellant.
796	
Frank E. Furst, et al., Appellants, vs. James G. Brewster, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, Mr. Frank F. Nesbit, and Mr. Mike Danaher for the appellants.
805	
Paramount-Famous Lasky Corporation, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry W. Taft and Mr. John W. Davis for the appellants.
820	
Frank L. Smith, et al., Appellants, vs. Illinois Bell Telephone Company.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom, Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson, Mr. George I. Haight, Mr. Edmund D. Adcock, and Mr. Benjamin F. Goldstein for the appellants.
845	
John W. Gamble, Appellant, vs. Herbert S. Daniel, Receiver.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis A. Brogan, Mr. C. A. Sorensen, and Mr. Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Arthur F. Mullen and Mr. Paul L. Martin for the appellee, in opposition thereto.
852	

The United States of America,
Appellant,
856 vs.
First National Pictures, Inc., et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the appellant.

The Daily Pantagraph, Incorporated,
Petitioner,
746 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arnold L. Guesner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Joseph H. Sheppard for the respondent.

The State of Alabama,
Petitioner,
817 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charlie C. McCall, Mr. Thomas E. Knight, Jr., and Mr. A. A. Evans for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. William J. Hughes for the respondent.

Gotham Can Company,
Petitioner,
832 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph R. Little for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

White Star Bus Line, Inc.,
Petitioner,
833 vs.
Heyward B. Roberts.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll G. Walter for the petitioner.

Charles A. Burckhardt, et al.,
Petitioners,
841 vs.
The Northwestern National Bank, etc. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. C. Bristol for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles A. Hart and Mr. Alfred A. Hampson for the respondents.

Balanced Rock Scenic Attraction, Inc., etc.
Petitioner,
842 vs.
The Town of Manitou, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred S. Caldwell for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. W. Dolph for the respondent.

Abbott Elliott Kay,
Petitioner,
843 vs.
The Federal Trade Commission of the United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Abbott Elliott Kay, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Charles H. Weston, Mr. Robert E. Healy, and Mr. Martin A. Morrison for the respondent.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.; Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner, vs. New York Life Insurance Company.	The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James H. McIntosh for the petitioner in No. 851; by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent in No. 851; and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. [illegible] Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. C. M. Charest and Mr. E. H. Horton for the petitioner in No. 949.
851	
949	
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Lenora E. Berry, as Administratrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward T. Miller, Mr. Frank C. Mann, and Mr. Alexander P. Stewart for the petitioner, and by Mr. John B. Pew for the respondent.
854	
Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Ruby Divine, Administratrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer B. Aikman for the petitioner, and by Mr. George O. Dix for the respondent.
858	
Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Jesse W. Divine, Jr., etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer B. Aikman for the petitioner, and by Mr. George O. Dix for the respondent.
859	

E. H. Matheny,
Petitioner,
860 vs.
Edwards Ice Machine & Supply Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur I. Moulton for the petitioner.

The Fidelity and Casualty Company of New York,
Petitioner,
862 vs.
Lenora Howe.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John G. Sherriff and Mr. W. Pitt Gifford for the petitioner, and by Mr. B. B. McGinnis for the respondent.

National Life Association,
Petitioner,
863 vs.
Lenora J. Howe.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John G. Sherriff, and Mr. W. Pitt Gifford for the petitioner, and by Mr. B. B. McGinnis for the respondent.

James H. Hooper,
Petitioner,
865 vs.
Mary Balulis, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James H. Hooper, pro se.

The United States ex rel. Walter E. Heller & Company,
Petitioner,
866 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan B. Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer for the respondent.

Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railway Company,
Petitioner,
868 vs.
Charles P. Noell, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the St. Louis Court of Appeals, State of Missouri, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph T. Finley, Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, Mr. James C. Jones, Jr., and Mr. Lon O. Hocker for the petitioner, and by Mr. David W. Hill for the respondents.

Grand Rapids Store Equipment Corporation, etc.,
Petitioner,
870 vs.
Weber Show Case & Fixture Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Liverance, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick S. Lyon and Mr. Leonard S. Lyon for the respondents.

L. N. Frantz,
Petitioner,
871 vs.
The State of West Virginia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Russell L. Ritz for the petitioner.

Arthur T. Galt,
Petitioner,
873 vs.
City of Chicago.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard F. Bishop for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson and Gottherd A. Dahlberg for the respondent.

Oak Worsted Mills,
Petitioner,
880 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore B. Benson and Mr. William Meyerhoff for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General [illegible], and Mr. Claude R. Branch, and George H. Foster for the respondent.

Taft Woolen Company,
Petitioner,
881 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore B. Benson and Mr. William Meyerhoff for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General [illegible], and Mr. Claude R. Branch, and George H. Foster for the respondent.

Jake Leininbach, alias Jake Lenemark, etc.,
Petitioner,
883 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Gray for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Frank Ross,
Petitioner,
886 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Bernard Handlan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
887 vs.
National Industrial Alcohol Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John G. Remey, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Robert L. Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. M. O'Hara for the respondent.

Elof Wenstrand,
Petitioner,
888 vs.
Albert Pick and Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel M. Dever for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel E. Hirsch for the respondent.

Go-Bart Importing Co. et al.,
Petitioners,
890 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Dickerman Williams for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The Pottstown Iron Company,
Petitioner,
892 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul F. Myers ~~and Mr. John R. Yates~~ for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Charles R. Pollard, ~~and Mr. Bradley B. Gilman~~ for the respondent.

Iron Mountain Oil Company,
Petitioner,
894 vs.
Acel G. Alexander, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry S. Conrad and Mr. Lisbon E. Durham for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Miss Helen R. Carloss for the respondent.

W. P. Brown & Sons Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
895 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. W. Spalding for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Norman D. Keller, and Mr. John G. Kemey for the respondent.

The United States,
Petitioner,
896 vs.
Felt & Tarrant Mfg. Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas G. Haight, Mr. Robert H. Montgomery, and Mr. J. Marvin Haynes for the respondent.

August Alksne,
Petitioner,
902 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Lewis and Mr. Matthew L. McGrath for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. A. W. Henderson for the respondent.

The First National Bank of Chicago, etc.,
Petitioner,
905 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold V. Amberg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Mugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. George H. Foster, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Franc-Strohmenger-Cowan, Inc.,
Petitioner,
907 vs.
Payette Neckwear Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifford E. Dunn, Mr. Holland S. Duell, Mr. Frederick P. Fish, and Mr. Charles Neave for the petitioner.

Grover Cleveland Curtis, et al.,
Petitioners,
908 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Julian C. Ryer for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Catherine Flynn ex rel. Chin King, Petitioner,
912 vs.
Anna C. M. Tillinghast, U. S. Commissioner of Immigration.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Everett Flint Damon and Mr. Walter Bates Farr for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Joe Capo, Petitioner,
938 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. V. Walton and Mr. Harold A. Henderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Eddie Satinover, Petitioner,
940 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank F. L'Engle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Great Lakes Broadcasting Company, Petitioner,	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the
944 vs.	District of Columbia was submitted to
Federal Radio Commission;	the consideration of the Court by Mr.
Wilbur Glenn Voliva, Petitioner,	Harry Eugene Kelly, Mr. Thornton M.
945 vs.	Pratt, and Mr. Carl H. Zeiss for the
Federal Radio Commission;	petitioner, Agricultural Broadcasting
Agricultural Broadcasting Company, Petitioner,	Company, and by Mr. Solicitor General
946 vs.	Thacher, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney
Federal Radio Commission.	General O'Brian, and Mr. Claude R.
	Branch for the respondent.

Angelo Marsiglia, alias Anthony Marsiglia, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit
947 vs.	Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit
The United States of America.	was submitted to the consideration of
	the Court by Mr. Angelo Marsiglia, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher,

Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, June 2 next, at

MONDAY, JUNE 2, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hodges, it is ordered that Joseph F. Gunster, Esquire, of Scranton, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jules Gilman Korner, Jr., It is ordered that Abraham H. Frisch, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward M. Reidy, It is ordered that Paul C. Carter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lewis Smith, It is ordered that John Paul Jones, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moultrie Hitt, It is ordered that Edwin F. Albertsworth, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Guider, It is ordered that Theodore Britton, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. B. Mathews, It is ordered that Northcutt Ely, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank L. Hatch, It is ordered that Clarence A. Ward, Esquire, of Rayway, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Selby, It is ordered that Wesley L. Nutten, Jr., Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jesse C. Adkins, It is ordered that George C. Holton, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. F. Summerall, It is ordered that Glenwood W. Rouse, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley Reed, It is ordered that H. R. Dysard, Esquire, of Ashland, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Karl F. Phillips, It is ordered that Preston H. Harris, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley Reed, It is ordered that Frank C. Malin, Esquire, of Ashland, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Katherine R. Pike, It is ordered that Amelia Fiedler Johnson, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert T. McCracken, It is ordered that D. Arthur Magaziner, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert T. McCracken, It is ordered that Gabriel D. Weiss, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert T. McCracken, It is ordered that Henry Arronson, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert T. McCracken, It is ordered that Howard M. Lutz, Esquire, of Media, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert T. McCracken, It is ordered that Harold L. Ervin, Esquire, of Media, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Porter J. McCumber, It is ordered that Frank W. Mondell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, It is ordered that Edward W. Madeira, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Frear, It is ordered that W. H. Markham, Esquire, of Horicon, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edgar C. Ellis, It is ordered that Joseph Grover Joyce, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Neale, It is ordered that Ray T. Miller, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Byrns, It is ordered that Burt Francis, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Willis C. Sears, It is ordered that Charles B. Morearty, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Hastings, It is ordered that H. V. Young, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. Alan Goldsborough, It is ordered that David M. Harrison, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. H. Andressen, It is ordered that Charles C. Neale, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence J. McLeod, It is ordered that Leonard S. Coyne, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Luther A. Johnson, It is ordered that Clyde W. Mays, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Florello H. LaGuardia, It is ordered that Christopher C. Cousins, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Wharton Pepper, It is ordered that John Cromwell Bell, Jr., Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Neale, It is ordered that David Ralph Hertz, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice said: "The Court is advised that Mr. Owen J. Roberts, of Pennsylvania, has been appointed an Associate Justice of this Court to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Justice Sanford. Mr. Roberts is present. The Clerk will read his commission. Mr. Roberts will then take the oath of office, and the marshal will escort him to the bench."

The clerk then read the commission as follows:

HERBERT HOOVER

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To all who shall see these presents, greeting:

Know ye: That reposing special trust and confidence in the wisdom, uprightness, and learning of Owen J. Roberts, of Pennsylvania, I have nominated, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and do authorize and empower him to execute and fulfill the duties of that office according to the Constitution and laws of the said United States, and to have and to hold the said office, with all the powers, privileges, and emoluments to the same of right appertaining unto him, the said Owen J. Roberts, during his good behavior.

In testimony whereof, I have caused these letters to be made patent and the seal of the Department of Justice to be hereunto affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this twentieth day of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirty, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and fifty-fourth.

Herbert Hoover.

By the President:

William D. Mitchell,

Attorney General.

The oath of office was then administered by the clerk, and Mr. Justice Roberts was escorted by the marshal to his seat on the bench.

New Orleans Public Service, Incorporated,

Appellant,

460 vs.

City of New Orleans.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Brinkerhoff-Faris Trust & Savings Company,

Petitioner,

464 vs.

Walter O. Hill, Treasurer and Ex-Officio Collector of Henry County, Missouri.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice McReynolds did not hear the argument and took no part in the decision of this case.

Surplus Trading Company,

Plaintiff in Error,

2 vs. In error to the Supreme Court of the

R. A. Cook, as Sheriff and Ex Officio State of Arkansas.

Collector of Taxes for Pulaski County,

Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Ann Arbor Railroad Company, The

Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway

Company, The Baltimore and Ohio

Railroad Company, et al., Appeal from the District Court of the

Appellants, United States for the Norther District

7 vs. of California.

The United States of America, The Inter-

state Commerce Commission and The Calif-

ornia Growers' & Shippers' Protective League.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Panama Mail Steamship Company, Petitioner, vs. Ernestina Isabelle Vargas.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

425

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, and the decree of the District Court in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, vacated, ~~with costs;~~ and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California with direction to make specific findings of fact and for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

and petitioner to pay one-half of the total costs in this Court and a like proportion of the cost in the Circuit Court of Appeals;

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

ORDER

It is ordered, that the following allotment be made of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of this Court among the circuits, agreeably to the acts of Congress in such case made and provided, and that such allotment be entered of record, viz:

For the First Circuit, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice.

For the Second Circuit, Harlan Fisk Stone, Associate Justice.

For the Third Circuit, Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justice.

For the Fourth Circuit, Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.

For the Fifth Circuit, Louis Dembitz Brandeis, Associate Justice.

For the Sixth Circuit, James C. McReynolds, Associate Justice.

For the Seventh Circuit, Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.

For the Eighth Circuit, Pierce Butler, Associate Justice.

For the Ninth Circuit, George Sutherland, Associate Justice.

For the Tenth Circuit, Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.

ORDER.

The rules of practice in admiralty heretofore promulgated by this Court (254 U. S. appendix) are amended by including therein a new rule numbered 46½ and reading as follows:

"In deciding cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction the court of first instance shall find the facts specially and state separately its conclusions of law thereon; and its findings and conclusions shall be entered of record, and, if an appeal is taken from the decree, shall be included by the clerk in the record which is certified to the appellate court under rule 49."

This new rule shall become effective October 1, 1930.

ORDER.

The rules of practice in equity heretofore promulgated by this Court (226 U. S. appendix) are amended by including therein a new rule numbered 70½ and reading as follows:

"In deciding suits in equity, including those required to be heard before three judges, the court of first instance shall find the facts specially and state separately its conclusions of law thereon; and its findings and conclusions shall be entered of record and, if an appeal is taken from the decree, shall be included by the clerk in the record which is certified to the appellate court under rules 75 and 76."

This new rule shall become effective October 1, 1930.

In the matter of George F. Curtis:

It having been shown to the Court that George F. Curtis, of Washington, District of Columbia, a member of the bar of this Court, has been disbarred from the practice of the law by the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia,

It is ordered that the said George F. Curtis be, and he is hereby, suspended from the practice of the law in this Court;

and it is further ordered that the Clerk of this Court send to the said Curtis notice to show cause, on or before Monday, October 6th next, why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ex parte:
Adele Salisbury, Petitioner,
—, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Vermont,
Complainant,
3, Original. vs.
The State of New Hampshire.

On consideration of the motion for leave to amend the bill of complaint in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John W. Gamble,
Appellant,
852 vs.
Herbert S. Daniel, Receiver.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John W. Gamble,
Appellant,
852 vs.
Herbert S. Daniel, Receiver.

On consideration of the motion for an extension of time within which to file a petition for writ of certiorari,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lloyd E. Sampsell and Ethan A. McNabb,
Petitioners,
953 vs.
The People of the State of California.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lloyd E. Sampsell and Ethan A. McNabb,
Petitioners,
953 vs.
The People of the State of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District, State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District, State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Miller Brothers Company,
Petitioner,
772 vs.
Lektophone Corporation.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for hearing immediately following No. 520, Lektophone Corporation v. The Rola Company.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Paramount Famous Lasky Corporation, et al.,
Appellants,
820 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 27th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
856 vs.
First National Pictures, Inc., et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 27th next, immediately following No. 820, Paramount Famous Lasky Corporation v. The United States of America.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Daniel P. O'Connell,
Petitioner,
844 vs.
The United States of America.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this case be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 20th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

District of Columbia, Petitioner, vs. William H. Colts. 857

It is now here ordered by this Court that this case be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 20th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

P. G. Fullerton, Appellant, vs. The State of Oklahoma ex rel. The Commissioners of the Land Office of said State. 760

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

P. G. Fullerton, Appellant, vs. The State of Oklahoma ex rel. The Commissioners of the Land Office of said State. 760

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Northport Power & Light Company,
Appellant,
763 vs.
Roland H. Hartley, as Governor, etc.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,
Appellant,
796 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank E. Furst, et al.,
Appellants,
805 vs.
James G. Brewster, et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Paramount Famous Lasky Corporation, et al.,
Appellants,
820 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank L. Smith, et al., etc., et al.,
Appellants,
845 vs.
Illinois Bell Telephone Company.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
856 vs.
First National Pictures, Inc., et al.

On consideration of the statement as to jurisdiction filed in this case, the Court finds that probable jurisdiction has been shown.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Daily Pantagraph, Incorporated, Petitioner,
746 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted, the briefs and argument to be limited to the question of the reduction of invested capital by reason of dividends paid, being the third question presented in the petition for the writ.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Oak Worsted Mills, Petitioner,
880 vs.
The United States.

ORDER ALLOWING CERTIORARI.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted, the briefs and argument to be limited to the question of the validity and effect of Sec. 611, Revenue Act of 1928, and the case is advanced to be heard immediately following No. 761, Percival E. Magee vs. The United States.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Taft Woolen Company, Petitioner,
881 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted, the briefs and argument to be limited to the question of the validity and effect of Sec. 611, Revenue Act of 1928, and the case is advanced to be heard immediately following No. 880, Oak Worsted Mills vs. The United States.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
887 vs.
National Industrial Alcohol Company, Inc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for hearing immediately following No. 741, Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue vs. Niagara Falls Brewing Company, et al.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Pottstown Iron Company,
Petitioner,
892 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for hearing immediately following Nos. 632 and 633, United States of America vs. Boston Buick Company, and the United States of America vs. Iron Cap Copper Company.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. P. Brown & Sons Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
895 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted, the briefs and argument to be limited to the question of the validity and effect of the waivers.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Franc-Strohmenger-Cowan, Inc., Petitioner,
907 vs.
Payette Neckwear Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for hearing immediately following No. 305, Franc-Strohmenger-Cowan, Inc. vs. Baro Forchheimer, doing business under the name and style of B. Forchheimer & Company, et al.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Alabama, Petitioner,
817 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
851 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York,

Petitioner,

949 vs.

New York Life Insurance Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Co-Bart Importing Co., Philip D. Cowen and William Bartels,

Petitioners,

890 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States,

Petitioner,

896 vs.

Felt & Tarrant Mfg. Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The First National Bank of Chicago, a National Banking Association, Petitioner,

905 vs.

The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gotham Can Company, Petitioner,

832 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Great Lakes Broadcasting Company, Petitioner,

944 vs.

Federal Radio Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wilbur Glenn Voliva,
Petitioner,
945 vs.
Federal Radio Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Agricultural Broadcasting Company,
Petitioner,
946 vs.
Federal Radio Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Autoquip Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
627 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

White Star Bus Line, Inc.,
Petitioner,
833 vs.
Heyward B. Roberts.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles A. Burckhardt and Fred A. Ballin,
Petitioners,
841 vs.
The Northwestern National Bank, a National Banking Association, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Balanced Rock Scenic Attractions, Inc., a Wyoming Corporation,
Petitioner,
842 vs.
The Town of Manitou, a Colorado municipal corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Abbott Elliott Kay,

Petitioner,

843 vs.

The Federal Trade Commission of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company,

Petitioner,

854 vs.

Lenora E. Berry, as Administratrix of the Estate of William W. Berry, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railway Company,

Petitioner,

858 vs.

Ruby Divine, Administratrix of the Estate of Annie Lynn Divine, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Jesse W. Divine, Jr., by his next friend Ruby Divine.

859 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

E. H. Matheny, Petitioner, vs. Edwards Ice Machine & Supply Company.

860 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Fidelity and Casualty Company of New York, Petitioner, vs. Lenora Howe,

862 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

National Life Association,
Petitioner,
863 vs.
Lenora J. Howe.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James H. Hooper,
Petitioner,
865 vs.
Mary Balulis, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States ex rel. Walter E. Heller & Company,
Petitioner,
866 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Charles P. Noell and Sidney Thorne Able. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the St. Louis Court of Appeals, of the State of Missouri.

868

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the St. Louis Court of Appeals, State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Grand Rapids Store Equipment Corporation, a Corporation, etc., Petitioner, vs. Weber Show Case & Fixture Company, a corporation and Thomas Toiven. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

870

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

L. N. Frantz, Petitioner, vs. The State of West Virginia. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

871

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arthur T. Galt,
Petitioner,
873 vs.
City of Chicago.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jake Leininbach, alias Jake Lenemark, alias Jake Leinebach,
Petitioner,
883 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank Ross,
Petitioner,
886 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Elof Wenstrand,
Petitioner,
888 vs.
Albert Pick and Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Iron Mountain Oil Company,
Petitioner,
894 vs.
Acel C. Alexander, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

August Aksne,
Petitioner,
902 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Grover Cleveland Curtis, Richard A. Bailey, Laurie Harrison and Lee Grant McArthur, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 908 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Catherine Flynn ex rel. Chin King, Petitioner, vs. Anna C. M. Tillinghast, U. S. Commissioner of Immigration. 912 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joe Capo, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 938 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Eddie Satinover,

Petitioner,

940 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Angelo Marsiglia, alias Anthony Marsiglia,

Petitioner,

947 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

ORDER.

All cases submitted, and all business before the Court, at this term, having been disposed of,

It is now here ordered by this Court that all cases on the docket be, and they are hereby, continued to the next term.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned to the time and place appointed

VOL

19

LUME

30

MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1930

At the Capitol of the United States, in the City of Washington, and District of Columbia, being the present Seat of the National Government of the United States, on the first Monday of October (being the 6th day of the same month) in the year of our Lord one thousand, nine hundred and thirty and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and fifty-fifth, The Supreme Court of the United States met agreeably to law.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert B. Hardison, It is ordered that Louis Charney Friedman, Esquire, of Paterson, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul D. P. Spearman, It is ordered that A. F. Kingdon, Esquire, of Bluefield, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Freer, It is ordered that Edward H. Bell, Esquire, of Middletown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard Townsend, It is ordered that Francis P. Farrell, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward Taylor Fenwick, It is ordered that John E. Snyder, Esquire, of Hershey, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William T. Chantland, It is ordered that Francis E. Delamore, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Marsh, It is ordered that William R. Carlisle, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles R. Allen, It is ordered that William Geo. Junge, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston B. Kavanagh, It is ordered that Francis Harold Uriell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ward Loveless, It is ordered that John Butera, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1930 - CONTINUED

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Bride, It is ordered that Alean Brisley Clutts, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dean C. Acheson, It is ordered that Cornelius B. Comegys, Esquire, of Scranton, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, It is ordered that Walter J. Rosston, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, It is ordered that John A. Coleman, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, It is ordered that Harry F. Brown, Esquire, of Guthrie, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that William W. Montgomery, Jr., Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. V. Cushman, It is ordered that Joe E. Daniels, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Benton, It is ordered that Winthrop Wadleigh, Esquire, of Milford, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer R. Hendricks, It is ordered that Ernest C. Griffith, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that K. Berry Peterson, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

R. D. Spicer, et al., Petitioners,
380 vs.
The United States of America;
G. C. Stephens, Petitioner,
381 vs.
The United States of America;
B. M. Wotkyns, Petitioner,
382 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, in that behalf, leave was granted the respondent to file brief on or before October 20th next.

Indian Motocycle Company,
5 vs.
The United States of America.

The joint motion to amend the certificate herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in that behalf.

The United States, Petitioner, vs. Swift and Company.	The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner.
56	
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Chicago Railway Equipment Company.	The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner.
231	
Annette Aiken, Administratrix of the estate of Friend M. Aiken, deceased, Petitioner, vs. Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.
69	
W. P. Brown & Sons Lumber Company, Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.
115	
Go-Bart Importing Co., et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.	The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent with leave to the petitioner to file opposition thereto by Friday next, on motion of Mr. Edward F. Colladay in that behalf.
111	
American Bond & Mortgage Company and Trianon, Inc. vs. The United States of America.	The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for The United States.
210	

Charles H. Mauts, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. W. L. Slayton.

60

The death of Charles H. Mauts, Collector of Internal Revenue, and the appointment of U. G. Denman as administrator of his estate having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that U. G. Denman, as administrator of the estate of Charles H. Mauts, be, and he hereby is, made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Sanford & Brooks Company.

31

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Willingham Loan and Trust Company.

53

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Niagara Falls Brewing Company, and Paul A. Schoellkopf, Chas. E. Haeberle, et al., etc.

61

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Annette Aiken, Administratrix of the Estate of Friend M. Aiken, Deceased, Petitioner,

69 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry Choteau, Petitioner,

81 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

109 vs.

National Industrial Alcohol Company, Inc.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. P. Brown & Sons Lumber Company, Petitioner,

115 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Black Hardware Company, Petitioner,
123 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr.Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
129 vs.
Sybil Whitehouse.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
199 vs.
Samuel F. Houston.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
202 vs.
Sallie H. Henry.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
203 vs.
William Hobart Porter and Andrew W. Porter, Executors of the Estate of William W. Porter, Deceased.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America ex rel. H. Wendell Endicott and Eliot Spalding, as Executors of the Estate of Henry B. Endicott, Deceased, Petitioners,
204 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, as Secretary of the Treasury, John Raymond McCarl, as Comptroller General of the United States, and Robert H. Lucas, as Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made a party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
223 vs.
First Trust and Savings Bank of Miami, Fla.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
231 vs.
Chicago Railway Equipment Company.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas, and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States ex rel. Edmund F. Leland,
Petitioner,
232 vs.
J. R. McCarl, Comptroller General of the United States, and Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,
It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made a party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Barde Steel Products Corporation,
Petitioner,
234 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,
It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Anahma Realty Corporation,
Petitioner,
243 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,
It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Great Northern Railway,
Petitioner,
247 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,
It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William C. Newman,
Petitioner,
268 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Diamond Shoe Company,
Petitioner,
277 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
288 vs.
Thompson Oil & Gas Company.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Miller & Vidor Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
310 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. James Eckert,
Petitioner,
351 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Arizona,
Complainant,
—, Original. vs.
The State of California, et al.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. K. Berry Peterson for the complainant.

The State of Wyoming,
Complainant,
—, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William O. Wilson for the complainant.

Standard Oil Company, et al.,
Appellants,
378 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Marsh for the appellants, in that behalf.

United States ex rel. Edmund F. Leland,
Petitioner,
232 vs.
J. R. McCarl, Comptroller General, etc., et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Frank S. Bright, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the United States Rubber Company as amicus curiae, in this cause.

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
12, Original. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The exceptions of Complainant herein to the report of the Special Master was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. M. Holden for the complainant.

The State of Connecticut, Complainant, 12, Original. vs. Commonwealth of Massachusetts.	The motion to set this case for hearing and disclaimer of intention to file exceptions to the report of the Special Master was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph E. Warner for the defendant.
Franc-Strohmenger & Cowan, Inc., Petitioner, 9 vs. Baro-Forchheimer, doing business under the name and style of B. Forchheimer & Company, et al.	The motion of Bachrach Company, Inc., and others for leave to intervene as parties respondents was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Milton Strasburger for the interveners in support thereof, and by Mr. Joe E. Daniels for the petitioner in opposition thereto.
Franc-Strohmenger & Cowan, Inc., Petitioner, 9 vs. Baro-Forchheimer, doing business under the name and style of B. Forchheimer & Company, et al.	The motion by the petitioner to dismiss the writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joe E. Daniels for the petitioner.
R. E. Graham and E. E. Foster, copartners, etc., Petitioners, 36 vs. Rex B. Goodcell, Former Collector, etc.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. Mark J. Ryan, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Marshall-Wells Company, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, et al., Appellants, 464 vs. W. G. Maxcy, as Receiver, etc., et al.	The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Suel O. Arnold for the appellants.

Elsie Aronstein,
Petitioner,
215 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Theodore L. Bailey, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Henri Picard, et al., and others as amici curiae, in this cause.

R. E. Graham and E. E. Foster, copartners, etc., Petitioners,
36 vs.
Rex B. Goodcell, Former Collector, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Carl Taylor and Mr. Rollin Browne, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Carl Taylor and Rollin Browne, as amici curiae, in this cause.

R. E. Graham and E. E. Foster, copartners, etc., Petitioners,
36 vs.
Rex B. Goodcell, Former Collector, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Robert A. Littleton, Mr. John O. Altman, Mr. Abraham Lowenhaupt, and Mr. Stanley Waite, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Fred Medart Manufacturing Co. and Pacific Porcelain Ware Co., as amici curiae, in this cause.

Standard Oil Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
545, October Term, 1928. vs.
City of Marysville, et al.

The motion for an order interpreting decision and directing form of mandate herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long for the respondents in support thereof and by Mr. James W. Reid for the petitioners in opposition thereto.

Indian Motocycle Company,
5 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. William Cogger, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Excelsior Motor Manufacturing & Supply Company, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

The State of Vermont, Complainant, vs. The State of New Hampshire. 3, Original.	The motion for leave to file stipulation amending answer herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Winthrop Wadleigh in that behalf.
The State of Vermont, Complainant, vs. The State of New Hampshire. 3, Original.	The motion for progress and for reference to a Special Master herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Warren R. Austin for the complainant.
Vermont Loan & Trust Company, Appellant, vs. W. D. Gillis, as Attorney General, etc.; New World Life Insurance Company, vs. W. D. Gillis, as Attorney General, etc. 26 27	The motion to reverse and remand, per stipulation, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles V. Imlay in behalf of counsel.
Packard Motor Car Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 196	On motion made to the Court by Mr. Ward Loveless, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of John C. Buchanan as amicus curiae, in this cause.
R. E. Graham and E. E. Foster, copartners, etc., Petitioners, vs. Rex B. Goodcell, former collector, etc. 36	On motion made to the Court by Mr. Ward Loveless, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Robert N. Miller, Donald V. Hunter, and S. Lyman Barber, as amici curiae, in this cause.
Raymond H. Moore, Petitioner, vs. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company. 265	The motion to waive rule requiring nine complete copies of the record herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Needham C. Turnage in behalf of Mr. Miller Belfield for the petitioner.

Joseph B. Straton, et al., 137 vs. Andy New, Jr., Trustee, etc.	The motion to bring up the entire record and cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur F. Kingdon for Andy New, Jr., Trustee, et al.
The Texas Company, Petitioner, 156 vs. Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary, etc.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. Charles F. Consaul, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Wyoming Oil Fields Company as amicus curiae, in this cause.
Marshall L. Mott, Petitioner, 78 vs. The United States of America.	The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. C. Trimble in behalf of Mr. Charles B. Rogers for the petitioner.
Various Items of Personal Property, etc., et al., Petitioners, 114 vs. The United States of America.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. W. J. Hughes, Jr., in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Bondholders' Committee, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
Abie State Bank, Appellant, 63 vs. Arthur J. Weaver, as Governor, etc., et al.	The suggestion of the appellee Willis M. Stebbins as to diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. R. Gower in behalf of counsel.

Abie State Bank,
Appellant,
63 vs.
Arthur J. Weaver as Governor, etc., et al.

The suggestion of Mary E. Gandy and others as to a diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. R. Gower and objection thereto submitted by Mr. Frank H. Gaines, Mr. Leonard S. Flansburg, and by Mr. Seymour S. Sidner for the appellant.

J. M. Robinson, et al.,
Appellants,
304 vs.
L. C. Holman, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file out of time the statement of points to be relied upon, designation of parts of record to be printed, and statement as to jurisdiction,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.
In the matter of the disbarment of Albert T. Patrick.

The report of the committee of the bar was presented to the consideration of the Court.

—, Original.
Ex parte: Adele T. Salisbury.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis and for leave to file amended petition for writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Adele T. Salisbury, pro se.

The State of New Mexico,
Complainant,
2, Original.
The State of Texas.

The report and statement of expenses of the Boundary Commissioner herein was presented to the consideration of the Court.

State of Vermont,
Complainant,
3, Original.
State of New Hampshire.

The motion of Commissioners for leave to file testimony herein was presented to the consideration of the Court.

The State of Wisconsin, et al., Complainants, vs. The State of Illinois, et al.; State of Michigan, et al., Complainants, vs. The State of Illinois, et al.; State of New York, et al., Complainants, vs. State of Illinois, et al.	The Semiannual report of the Sanitary District of Chicago filed July 1, 1930, was presented to the consideration of the Court.
6, Original. 10, Original. 11, Original.	
The State of Louisiana, Complainant, vs. The State of Mississippi.	The exceptions by defendant to the report of the Special Master was presented to the consideration of the Court.
8, Original.	
Commonwealth of Kentucky, Complainant, vs. State of Indiana, et al.	The report of defendant, the State of Indiana, filed pursuant to the decree of this Court, was presented to the consideration of the Court.
15, Original.	
The Interstate Commerce Commission, Petitioner, vs. Northern Pacific Railroad Company, et al.	The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. F. Lyons, Mr. F. G. Dorety, and Mr. R. J. Hagman for the respondents in support of the motion, and by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton and Mr. Nelson Thomas for the petitioner in opposition thereto.
67	

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
88 vs.
Atlanta, Birmingham & Coast Railroad Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. B. Crier, Mr. John A. Hynds, and Mr. Robert C. Alston for the appellee in support of the motion and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Elmer H. Collins, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, and Mr. Edward M. Reidy for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Fred J. Elser, as special administrator, etc., Petitioner,
133 vs.
Asia Banking Corporation.

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allison D. Gibbs for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. Clyde Alton DeWitt, Mr. Eugene Arthur Perkins, Mr. David A. Buckley, Jr., and Mr. William Catron Rigby for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

Thomas W. Fleming, Appellant,
159 vs.
The State of Ohio.

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ray T. Miller, Mr. Robert T. Scott, and Mr. David Ralph Hertz for the appellee in support of the motion and by Mr. Alexander H. Martin for the appellant, in opposition thereto.

A. J. Waldock, Appellant,
161 vs.
J. Q. Newell, Warden of the Oklahoma State Penitentiary.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for appellant has filed a motion to dismiss the appeal in this cause at the cost of the appellant,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Peter Manke, Petitioner, 187 vs. The United States of America.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Sooy for the petitioner.
H. Ely Goldsmith, Petitioner, 190 vs. The United States of America.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Ely Goldsmith pro se.
Joseph S. Kalasanckas, Petitioner, 220 vs. Frank T. Hines, Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hallock P. Long.
Perigus Marceaux, Petitioner, 403 vs. Police Jury of Vermillion Parish.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. McCoy for the petitioner.
Joseph F. Fitzgerald, et al., Petitioners, 469 vs. The Union Central Life Insurance Company.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph F. Fitzgerald, pro se.
Columbus & Greenville Railway Company, et al., Appellants, 195 vs. W. J. Miller, State Tax Collector, etc.	The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Butler for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. William H. Watkins and Mr. A. F. Gardner, Sr., for the appellants, in opposition thereto.

The American Oil Company,
Appellant,
256 vs.
Josephine Metz, et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter C. Capper for the appellee.

Seth M. Milliken, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
87 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. A. Embury for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

Roberts Sash & Door Company,
Petitioner,
97 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse I. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

Jeff P. Mix,
Petitioner,
98 vs.
Henry Sternberg, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Dodd for the petitioner.

Adam Schumann Associates, Inc.,
Petitioner,
99 vs.
The City of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. Ellery Edwards for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly and Mr. J. Joseph Lilly for the respondent.

Riverside & Dan River Cotton Mills, Inc.,
Petitioner,
100 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Marvin Haynes, Mr. Robert H. Montgomery, and Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Charles R. Pollard for the respondent.

York Safe & Lock Company,
Petitioner,
101 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Marvin Haynes, Mr. Robert H. Montgomery, and Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Charles R. Pollard for the respondent.

Graniteville Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
208 vs.
The United States;
National Equipment Company,
Petitioner,
209 vs.
The United States.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer Hendricks and Mr. J. Robert Sherrod for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Charles R. Pollard for the respondent.

United States ex rel. Edmund F. Leland,
Petitioner,
232 vs.
J. R. McCarl, Comptroller General of the United States, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Craig Peacock and Mr. John W. Townsend for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Harry F. Waite,
Petitioner,
103 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. Ellery Edwards ~~Joseph W. Cox~~ for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Percy M. Cox, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Mattie Howard,
Petitioner,
107 vs.
Odie O. Owens.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Neff for the petitioner, and by Mr. John S. Severson for the respondent.

T. H. McCarthy, et al.,
Petitioners,
110 vs.
Bloedel Donovan Lumber Mills.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Williams and William H. Griffin for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. S. McCord and Mr. W. B. McCord for the respondent.

Various Items of Personal Property, etc.
Petitioners,
114 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis Landes for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

George A. Stewart, as Trustee, etc., et al., Petitioners,
117 vs.
Nebraska Tire & Rubber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. McVann for the petitioners.

Mary Burnley Wilson Christian, et al., Petitioners,
118 vs.
Richard Baxter Wilson's Executors and others.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. H. Williams for the petitioners, and by Mr. Littleton M. Wickham for the respondents.

E. Massagli, doing business as San Francisco Concrete Co., etc., Petitioner,
119 vs.
T. I. Butler Co., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence A. Linn for the petitioner.

A. R. Demory Investment Co., Petitioner,
120 vs.
John P. Haese, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul B. Cromelin, Mr. Bolitha J. Laws, and Mr. Francis Price for the petitioner, and by Mr. Isaac Pacht for the respondent.

John Davis, Petitioner,
121 vs.
Tolowa Royalties, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles West for the petitioner.

American Molasses Company, Petitioner,
122 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Adrian C. Humphreys, Mr. S. M. Stroock, Mr. Charles C. Carlin, and Mr. M. Carter Hall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. George H. Foster, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Black Hardware Company, Petitioner,
123 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John David Watkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. Harvey R. Gamble, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Walter E. Carr, Director of Immigration, etc., Petitioner,
125 vs.
Mateo Zaja.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Luhring, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Frank M. Parrish for the petitioner.

United States of America ex rel. Costas Cateches, Petitioner,
336 vs.
Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold Van Riper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

William J. Robb, Jr., et al., Petitioners,
127 vs.
Noxon Chemical Products Co., Inc., et al.;
Charles R. S. Leckie, et al., Petitioners,
128 vs.
Noxon Chemical Products Co., Inc., et al.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Clement K. Corbin for the petitioners in No. 127, by Mr. Maximilian M. Stallman for the petitioners in No. 128, and by Mr. James F. Meagher for the respondents.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
129 vs.
Sybil Whitehouse.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Morton P. Fisher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Spottswood D. Bowers and Mr. Robert W. Candler for the respondent.

Leonard Daniel Ingram, Petitioner,
130 vs.
Philip A. Lewis, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Chandler for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. Emmett Stewart and Mr. Daniel Haden Linebaugh for the respondents.

Leonard Daniel Ingram, Petitioner,
188 vs.
Carter W. Wesley, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Chandler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward S. Boyles for the respondents.

George B. Davis, Bankrupt, Petitioner, 132 vs. National Surety Company, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard B. Montgomery for the petitioner.
Fred J. Elser, as special administrator of the estate of Henry W. Elser, deceased, Petitioner, 133 vs. Asia Banking Corporation.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. A. DeWitt and Mr. Eugene A. Perkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Allison D. Gibbs for the respondent.
United States Can Company, Petitioner, 135 vs. Mrs. Theodora Ryan.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wayne Ely for the petitioner, and by Mr. David W. Hill for the respondent.
Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway Company, Petitioner, 171 vs. Cecile S. Cole.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Carey, Mr. Charles A. Hart, and Mr. Charles E. McCulloch for the petitioner.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
284 vs.
Charles G. Stewart,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. A. Foote and Mr. Benjamin D. Holt for the petitioner, and by Mr. William L. Day and Mr. Luther Day for the respondent.

Board of County Commissioners of Rogers County, Oklahoma,
Petitioner,
136 vs.
Bristow Battery Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eugene Jordan for the petitioner.

Hilary Halbert, Jr., et al., Petitioners,
141 vs.
The United States of America;

Rich Halbert, a minor, by Fred P. Halbert, Guardian, ad litem, Petitioner,
142 vs.
The United States of America;

Vernon Sidney Halbert, a minor, by Benjamin F. Halbert, Guardian, ad litem,
143 vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America;

Sidney E. Halbert, a minor, by Sidney Seth Halbert, Guardian, ad litem,
144 vs. Petitioner,
The United States of America;

Rose Peers Pickernell, et al., Petitioners,
145 vs.
The United States of America;

Lulu M. Elliott, et al., Petitioners,
146 vs.
The United States of America;

Mary Barichio Petit, et al., Petitioners,
147 vs.
The United States of America;

Dewey Barichio, et al., Petitioners,
148 vs.
The United States of America;

Edna May Elliott, et al., Petitioners,
149 vs.
The United States of America;

Chas. G. Elliott, Jr., Petitioners,
150 vs.
The United States of America;

Agnes Rubens, et al., Petitioners,
151 vs.
The United States of America;

Virginia Walkowaky, et al., Petitioners,
152 vs.
The United States of America;

Lizzie Rolfson, et al., Petitioners,
153 vs.
The United States of America;

Mary Francis Provoe, et al., Petitioners,
154 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Overton G. Ellis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Pedro Capo Rodriguez, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
155 vs.
H. E. Martin, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Leake for the petitioner.

The Texas Company, Petitioner,
156 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer, Mr. C. B. Ames, and Mr. Edward M. Freeman, ~~and Mr. William J. Neale~~ for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Nat M. Lacy, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Henry Seinfel, et al., Petitioners,
157 vs.
Theodore B. Hennenlotter, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold R. Medina for the petitioners, and by Mr. Matt Goldstein for the respondents.

C. D. Clay,
Petitioner,
158 vs.
Mobile & Ohio Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marion W. Reily for the petitioner and by Mr. Carl Fox for the respondent.

Thomas W. Fleming,
Petitioner,
159 vs.
The State of Ohio.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander H. Martin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ray T. Miller and Mr. David Ralph Hertz for the respondent.

Salisbury Transportation Company,
Petitioner,
162 vs.
Stark Electric Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Guider, Mr. Frank J. Hogan, and Mr. Sidney L. Geiger for the petitioner.

Flora Whitebird, et al.,
Petitioners,
163 vs.
The Eagle-Picher Lead Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. B. Ames for the petitioners, and by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, Mr. W. B. Thompson, and Mr. A. C. Wallace for the respondents.

Czarnikow-Rionda Company,
Petitioner,
164 vs.
United States of America, Owner of the Steamship "Lake Canaveral."

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Roberson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Hugh McElvogue,
Petitioner,
167 vs.
The United States of America;
William J.Brown,
Petitioner,
168 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Hugh McElvogue pro se, by William J.Brown pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.

Lila Longson,
Petitioner,
169 vs.
David Belasco.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Lila Longson pro se, and by Mr. Nathan Burkan for the respondent.

Pillsbury Flour Mills Company,
Petitioner,
170 vs.
Interlake Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. Roger Englar, Mr. Henry N. Longley, and Mr. Ezra G. Benedict Fox for the petitioner, and by Mr. George W. Cottrell and Mr. Thomas C. Burke for the respondent.

Emil E. Passailaigue,
Petitioner,
172 vs.
Walter I. Herron, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. N. B. K. Pettingill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Donald C. McMullen for the respondents.

Stanley Securities Company,
Petitioner,
173 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bernhard Knollenberg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Abraham M. Ellis,
Petitioner,
174 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Cox and Mr. F. Hunter Creech for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. William W. Scott for the respondent.

Weed & Brother,
Petitioner,
175 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald Horne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Paul D. Miller, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

Edward A. Pagel, as Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
176 vs.
Selma Hallbom.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry T. Ronning for the petitioner.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
177 vs.
Frank Russo, Administrator, etc.;
The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
178 vs.
Frank Russo, Administrator, etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana and to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert H. Cole for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry M. Dowling for the respondent.

Farbwerke vormals Meister Lucius & Bruning, et al., etc., Petitioners,
179 vs.
Chemical Foundation, Inc., et al.;

Farbwerke vormals Meister Lucius & Bruning, Petitioner,
180 vs.
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., et al.;

Deutsche Gold & Silber Scheide Anstalt vorm. Roessler, Petitioner,
181 vs.
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., et al.;

Badische Anilin & Soda-Fabrik, Petitioner,
182 vs.
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., et al.;

Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of the United States, Petitioner,
271 vs.
The Chemical Foundation, Inc.;

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, Petitioner,
272 vs.
Farbwerke vormals Meister Lucius & Bruning, et al.;

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, Petitioner,
273 vs.
Deutsche Gold & Silber Scheide Anstalt Vorm. Roessler, et al.;

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, Petitioner,
274 vs.
Badische Anilin & Soda-Fabrik, et al.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick H. Wood, Mr. Almuth C. Vandiver, and Mr. Charles F. Curry for the petitioners in Nos. 179, 180, 181 and 182, by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioners in Nos. 271, 272, 273, and 274, and by Mr. Joseph H. Choate, Jr., Mr. Wm. G. Mahaffy, Mr. S. M. Stellwagin, Mr. G. Carroll Todd, Mr. J. P. Laffey, Mr. W. S. Gregg, Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. J. Frank Staley, and Mr. Thos. B. Rhodes for the respondents in Nos. 179, 180, 181 and 182, and by Mr. G. Carroll Todd, Mr. Joseph H. Choate, Mr. Wm. G. Mahaffy and Mr. S. M. Stellwagin for the respondents in Nos. 271, 272, 273 and 274.

M. P. Mathis,
Petitioner,
184 vs.
J. A. Ligon, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. Dale Wolfe and Mr. W. M. Haulsee for the petitioners.

Mary E. Little, Executrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
185 vs.
Harwood Keaton, Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank T. McCoy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert B. Keenan for the respondent.

Norfolk and Western Railway Company,
Petitioner,
186 vs.
F. L. Aylor, Trading as Clarke Milling Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. M. Rivinus and Mr. James F. Wright for the petitioner.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Petitioner,
189 vs.
Mamie F. Jolly, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. M. Warren, Mr. E. S. Jouett, Mr. J. H. McChord, and Mr. S. D. Rouse for the petitioner, and by Mr. Johnst Northcutt for the respondent.

Joseph Reynolds, et al., Petitioners,
191 vs.
Harry E. Schmidt, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles West for the petitioners.

Pan American Petroleum and Transport Company, Petitioner,
192 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. I. Clark and Mr. Eugene Underwood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Frank Staley, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The Star Metal Mfg. Co., et al., Petitioners,
194 vs.
The Allen Filter Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Hayward Fairbanks for the petitioners, and by Mr. Percy H. Moore for the respondent.

Columbus & Greenville Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
195 vs.
W. J. Miller, State Tax-Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Watkins and Mr. A. F. Gardner, Sr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. George Butler for the respondent.

Packard Motor Car Company,
Petitioner,
196 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Robert Sherrod and Mr. Robert N. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Claude R. Branch, for the respondent.

Mrs. Blanche F. Coughlin,
Petitioner,
197 vs.
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. A. Simmons and Mr. Thos. H. Ball for the petitioner, and by Mr. Nelson Phillips and Mr. Jos. W. Jamison for the respondent.

John W. Gamble,
Petitioner,
198 vs.
Herbert S. Daniel, as Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis A. Brogan, Mr. Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., and Mr. C. A. Sorensen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur F. Mullen and Mr. Paul L. Martin for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
199 vs.
Samuel F. Houston.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. John G. Remey, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Allin H. Pierce for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. Clarke Mason for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

202 vs.

Sallie H. Henry.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. John G. Remey, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Allin H. Pierce for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. Clarke Mason for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

203 vs.

William Hobart Porter, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. John G. Remey, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Allin H. Pierce for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter Lee Sheppard for the respondents.

Daniel J. Halpin, as Trustee, etc.,

Petitioner,

200 vs.

Savannah River Electric Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. W. Robinson, Mr. E. H. Callaway, and Mr. George E. O'Connor for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. B. Crier for the respondent.

Elizabeth Miller Bowman,

Petitioner,

201 vs.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Ludlow for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. John Spalding Flannery, and Mr. George Bowdoin Craighill for the respondent.

United States ex rel. H. Wemmell Endicott, et al., Petitioners,
204 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, as Secretary, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Harry Covington, Mr. Spencer Gordon, and Mr. Newell W. Ellison for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

J. T. Rose, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
205 vs.
John W. Grant;
J. T. Rose, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
206 vs.
John W. Grant, et al.

The petitions for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner in No. 205; by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner in No. 206; and by Mr. John M. Slaton and Mr. Richard H. Wilmer for the respondents.

Abby F. Means, Petitioner,
207 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Perry, Mr. Arthur A. Ballantine, and Mr. George E. Cleary for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

Quick Action Ignition Company, et al., Petitioners,
211 vs.
The Maytag Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard M. Cox and Mr. Amasa C. Paul for the petitioners, and by Mr. William H. Davis for the respondent.

James J. Mars, Executor, etc., et al, Petitioners,
212 vs.
Daniel A. McDougal, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Smith for the petitioners, and by Mr. Daniel A. McDougal, Mr. Leonard O. Lytle, Mr. William V. Pryor, Mr. Charles B. Rockwood, and Mr. Nathan A. Gibson for the respondents.

Osburn California Corporation, Petitioner,
213 vs.
Galen H. Welch, United States Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph W. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Harvey R. Gamble, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. F. W. DeWart for the respondent.

Bank Savings Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
214 vs.
Nellie E. Butler.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. W. Broaddus and Mr. F. W. McAllister for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred A. Boxley for the respondent.

Elsie Aronstein, Petitioner,
215 vs.
The New York Central Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Emmet L. Holbrook for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jacob Aronson and Mr. William Mann for the respondent.

The United States, Petitioner, 216 vs. Dorothy Whitney Elmhirst, nee Straight, Executrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Swager Sherley, Mr. Frederick DeC. Faust, and Mr. Charles F. Wilson for the respondent.
Percy W. Pickford, et al., Petitioners, 221 vs. E. Hilton Jackson, Receiver; Harry M. Kaufman, et al., Petitioners, 222 vs. E. Hilton Jackson, Receiver.	The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence Koenigsberger for the petitioners.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 223 vs. The First Trust & Savings Bank of Miami.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. H. Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Conner, Mr. C. M. Charest and Mr. Allin H. Pierce for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. S. Hammers for the respondent.
Higman Towing Company, Owner of Tug "Lutcher Brown," Petitioner, 224 vs. S. S. "Southseas" and Petroleum Navigation Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Brantley Harris and Mr. John David Watkins for the petitioner.

Arthur Hind,
Petitioner,
225 vs.
Jesse W. Clark, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. R. Dewey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Frischer & Co., Inc., et al.,
Petitioners,
226 vs.
Tariff Commission, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Meyer Kraushaar for the petitioners, and by Mr. Albert MacC. Barnes, Jr., for the respondents.

Will Friedrichsen,
Petitioner,
227 vs.
Guaranty Trust Company of New York;
Will Friedrichsen,
Petitioner,
228 vs.
Guaranty Trust Company of New York.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. C. Mathes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin S. S. Sunderland and Mr. Thomas O'C. FitzGibbon for the respondents.

Mary T. Gamage, et al.,
Petitioners,
229 vs.
Masonic Cemetery Association, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Aaron M. Sargent, Mr. Peter tum Suden and Mr. Sidney M. Van Wyck, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward I. Barry for the respondents.

Lee Calvin Moore, Petitioner,
230 vs.
W. T. Pate, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. D. Redmond for the petitioner, and by Mr. Marcellus Green and Mr. Garner W. Green for the respondents.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
231 vs.
Chicago Railway Equipment Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. S. Oppenheim for the respondent.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners,
233 vs.
Lurline J. Bell, as Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Louis M. Shimel for the respondent.

Barde Steel Products Corporation, Petitioner,
234 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. W. Spalding and Mr. Roscoe C. Nelson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. John Vaughan Groner, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Randolph C. Shaw for the respondent.

Edward F. Flynn, as Executor, etc., Petitioner, 235 vs. The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas R. FitzSimmons for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward R. Brumley for the respondent.
Maryland Casualty Company, Petitioner, 236 vs. Nannie L. Massey.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward B. Klewer for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. D. Minor for the respondent.
Sacramento Suburban Fruit Lands Company, Petitioner, 238 vs. H. A. Lindquist, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John L. McNab for the petitioner.
Alvis Maynard, Administrator, etc., Petitioner, 239 vs. W. K. Elliott, Trustee, etc.; John B. Varney, Petitioner, 240 vs. W. K. Elliott, Trustee, etc.; J. M. Smith, et al., Petitioners, 241 vs. W. K. Elliott, Trustee, etc.; A. G. Rutherford, Petitioner, 242 vs. W. K. Elliott, Trustee, etc.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Randolph Bias and Mr. Wells Goodykoontz for the petitioners, and by Mr. Stanley Reed for the respondent.

Anahma Realty Corporation,
Petitioner,
243 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin Taylor and Mr. Nathaniel T. Guernsey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John Vaughan Groner, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Forrest Nash Robertson,
Petitioner,
244 vs.
The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick M. Miner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas D. O'Brien, Mr. Alexander E. Horn, and Mr. Edward S. Stringer for the respondent.

Luther H. Reichelderfer, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
245 vs.
American Security and Trust Company, et al.;
Luther H. Reichelderfer, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
246 vs.
Christian Heurich.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Bride, Mr. Vernon E. West, and Mr. F. H. Stephens for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Wilton J. Lambert, Mr. John S. Flannery, Mr. Rudolph H. Yeatman, Mr. C. Bowdoin Craighill, and Mr. Alexander H. Bell for the respondents.

Luther H. Reichelderfer, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
414 vs.
William W. Dodge.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Bride, Mr. Vernon E. West, and F. H. Stephens for the petitioners.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
247 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. C. Dorety and Mr. J. P. Plunkett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John Vaughan Groner, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Percy S. Crewe for the respondent.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,
Petitioner,
248 vs.
Ida M. Fultz, Administratrix, etc.;
The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,
249 vs.
Ida M. Fultz, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana and to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert H. Cole for the petitioner, and by Mr. Tom Davis and Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondent.

Dora I. Nickman,
Petitioner,
250 vs.
The New York Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Cline for the petitioner, and by Mr. James R. Garfield for the respondent.

C. Perez Rubio,
Petitioner,
251 vs.
Collector of Internal Revenue.
and Dean Hill Stanley,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. A. DeWitt, Mr. E. A. Perkins and Mr. David A. Buckley, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Cattron Rigby, Mr. W. A. Graham, and Mr. Edward A. Kreger for the respondent.

The United States, Petitioner,
252 vs.
Artemus C. Wells, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner.

First National Bank of Biloxi, Mississippi, et al., Petitioners,
253 vs.
Board of Supervisors of Harrison County, Mississippi.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. L. Guice and Mr. T. J. Wills for the petitioners.

Arthur Curtiss James, Petitioner,
254 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Coulson, Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, Jr., and Mr. H. C. Kilpatrick for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Charles R. Pollard for the respondent.

Arthur Curtiss James, et al., Petitioners,
255 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Coulson, Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, Jr., and Mr. H. C. Kilpatrick for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Charles H. Pollard for the respondent.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
257 vs.
George R. Smith.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred C. Hector for the petitioner.

William T. May, et al., Petitioners,
258 vs.
Benjamin Marbury, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. U. G. Hahn and Mr. Joseph Higgins for the petitioners, and by Mr. Albert Williams for the respondents.

E. C. Atkins & Company, Petitioner,
259 vs.
Harry Dunn, as Auditor, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph J. Daniels, Mr. Samuel Ashby, and Mr. Albert Baker for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Thompson and Mr. Albert L. Rabb for the respondents.

Eunice V. Avery, Petitioner,
260 vs.
Catherine Vernon, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Lemm for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gwynn Gardiner for the respondents.

Standard Marine Insurance Company, Ltd.,
Petitioner,
261 vs.
Scottish Metropolitan Assurance Company, Ltd.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Russell T. Mount for the petitioner and by Mr. T. Catesby Jones and Mr. James W. Ryan for the respondent.

William J. Briley, et al.,
Petitioners,
262 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin W. Sims and Mr. Elwood G. Godman for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Charles H. Weston, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Maas & Waldstein Company,
Petitioner,
263 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Holmes, Mr. W. A. Sutherland, and Mr. Donald Havens for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Charles R. Pollard for the respondent.

Raymond H. Moore,
Petitioner,
265 vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter F. Boye for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur C. Fraser, and Mr. Duncan K. Brent for the respondent.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
266 vs.
D. D. Covington.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Davis, and Mr. F. L. Willcox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Philip H. Arrowsmith for the respondent.

Panhard Oil Corporation,
Petitioner,
267 vs.
Societe Anonyme Des Anciens Etablissements Panhard & Levassor.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Julian S. Wooster for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hugo Mock, and Mr. Asher Blum for the respondent.

William C. Newman,
Petitioner,
268 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Garnett, Mr. Preston C. West, Mr. A. A. Davidson, Mr. Nathan A. Gibson, and Mr. Joseph L. Hull for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. Randolph C. Shaw, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Percy S. Crewe for the respondent.

Piggly Wiggly Corporation,
Petitioner,
269 vs.
Jitney Jungle Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest W. Bradord and Mr. William H. Watkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. James M. Flowers for the respondent.

F. W. Woolworth Company,
Petitioner,
270 vs.
R. E. Davis.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard K. Bridges, and Mr. Randolph Shirk for the petitioner, and by Mr. Peter Q. Nyce for the respondent.

Central Vermont Transportation Company,
Petitioner,
275 vs.
The Barge "Harford", et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence Bishop Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. Catesby Jones and Mr. James W. Ryan for the respondents.

The Atlantic Refining Company,
Petitioner,
276 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams, Mr. Ira Jewell Williams, Jr., Mr. John H. Stone, Mr. Francis Shunk Brown, and Mr. Charles L. Guerin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.

Diamond Shoe Company,
Petitioner,
277 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. H. Frisch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. Norman D. Keller, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Concordia Insurance Company of Milwaukee, Petitioner,

278 vs.

School District No. 98 of Payne County;

Royal Insurance Company, Ltd., Petitioner,

279 vs.

School District No. 98 of Payne County;

National Fire Insurance Company, Petitioner,

280 vs.

School District No. 98 of Payne County;

Fire Association of Philadelphia, Petitioner,

281 vs.

School District No. 98 of Payne County.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. A. Rittenhouse for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. M. Rainey and Mr. Streeter B. Flynn for the respondent.

Bonwit Teller & Company,

Petitioner,

282 vs.

The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur B. Hyman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

Clinchfield Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

283 vs.

Elice M. Dunn, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Price for the petitioner, and by Mr. P. A. Bonham and Mr. Robert Burrow for the respondent.

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company, Petitioner,
285 vs.
Weil Brothers.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ray Rushton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Richard T. Rives for the respondent.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
286 vs.
Southern Coal, Coke & Mining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, Fourth District, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. H. Leake and Mr. Wm. G. Wise for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward C. Kramer and Mr. Bruce A. Campbell for the respondent.

The Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
287 vs.
The Manila Railroad Company of the Philippine Islands.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Cattron Rigby and Mr. E. A. Kreger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jose C. Abreau for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
288 vs.
Thompson Oil & Gas Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. Paul D. Miller, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the petitioner.

Dora Wenglinsky,
Petitioner,
289 vs.
John L. Zurbrick, District Director of Immigration, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leonard S. Coyne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, Mr. Frank M. Parrish, Mr. W. Marvin Smith and Mr. Albert E. Reitzel for the respondent.

John H. Glass, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.,
Petitioner,
291 vs.
John Cumming, Jr.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Arthur Brown for the petitioner, and Mr. Eugene Mackey for the respondent.

The United States of America ex rel. Stanton K. Livingston,
Petitioner,
292 vs.
Frank T. Hines, Director, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel T. Ansell and Mr. George M. Wilmeth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. W. Clifton Stone, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, and Mr. James T. Brady for the respondent.

Fred E. Suits, et al.,
Petitioners,
293 vs.
Magnolia Petroleum Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred E. Suits, Mr. J. B. Dudley, Mr. J. H. Everest, and Mr. Wilbur J. Holleman for the petitioners, and by Mr. W. H. Francis, Mr. B. B. Blakeney, and Mr. Hubert Ambrister for the respondent.

Henry Vogt Machine Co., Petitioner,
294 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Adrian C. Humphreys and Mr. Chester A. Gwinn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

Bellair, Benwood and Wheeling Ferry Company, Petitioner,
295 vs.
The Interstate Bridge Company, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell for the petitioner, and by Mr. James Morgan Clarke and Mr. Charles McCamic for the respondents.

A. D. Pierce, et al., Petitioners,
297 vs.
Albion Idaho Land Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. T. Lowe for the petitioners.

White River Levee District, Petitioner,
298 vs.
McWilliams Dredging Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles T. Coleman for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. W. Davis for the respondent.

Carlo DeLuca,

Petitioner,

299 vs.

The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Woog and Mr. William D. Harris for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Mugg, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Sam E. Finley,

Petitioner,

300 vs.

MacDougald Construction Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifford L. Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Slaton, Mr. John A. Sibley, and Mr. Ellis Spear, Jr., for the respondent.

Mary Louise Thomas, a minor, etc.,

Petitioner,

301 vs.

Sid Jones, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred E. Suits for the petitioner.

Marco Colpo,

Petitioner,

302 vs.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Lowry Humes for the petitioner.

Josefa Aguayo Casals,

Petitioner,

303 vs.

Elvira Juana Manuela Joaquina Garcia Fernandez.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jose Tous Soto for the petitioner.

The La Mesa, Lemon Grove and Spring Valley Irrigation District,
Petitioner,
305 vs.
City of San Diego.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert J. Lee, Mr. H. W. O'Melveny, Mr. Walter K. Tuller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. J. Hunsaker, Mr. E. W. Britt, and Mr. T. B. Cosgrove for the respondent.

B. Altman & Company,
Petitioner,
308 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Hartfield and Mr. A. C. Newlin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.

Robert Proctor, Receiver of New England Oil Refining Co., et al.,
Petitioners,
309 vs.
First National Bank of Boston.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Romney Spring for the petitioner, and by Mr. George S. Fuller for the respondent.

Miller & Vidor Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
310 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. S. Hammers and Mr. John Neethe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Miss Helen R. Carloss, Mr. Paul D. Miller, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. John Mac C. Hudson for the respondent.

National Brake & Electric Company,
Petitioner,
311 vs.
Niels A. Christensen and Allis-Chalmers Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Charles A. Brown and Mr. Paul Synnestvedt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Quarles, Mr. Newton D. Baker, Mr. Joseph B. Cotton, and Mr. William R. Rummler for the respondents.

Charles Burnham Squire,
Petitioner,
312 vs.
H. Ray Paige.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Hendrick for the petitioner.

Sigvard B. Johnsen,
Petitioner,
314 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert B. McMillan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. A. W. Henderson, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Hannah M. Smith, Administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
315 vs.
Springdale Amusement Park, Ltd., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb and Mr. John E. Sater for the petitioner.

Associated Bill Posters of the United States and Canada, et al., Petitioners,
317 vs.
Wm. H. Rankin Co.;
Associated Bill Posters of the United States and Canada, et al., Petitioners,
318 vs.
Charles A. Ramsey Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George F. Hurd and Mr. Richard T. Green for the petitioners, and by Mr. Nathan Burkan, Mr. Emanuel Harris, Mr. Thos. G. Haight, and Mr. Sol A. Rosenblatt for the respondents.

The Denver and Salt Lake Railway Company, Petitioner,
319 vs.
Frank Lombardi.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elmer L. Brock, Mr. David W. Oyler, and Mr. E. R. Campbell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur B. Bouton for the respondent.

Edward Blanchard, Petitioner,
320 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Atkinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Garnett D. Ripley, et al., Petitioners,
321 vs.
Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Calhoun, Mr. Walter C. Balderson, Mr. M. Carter Hall, and Mr. Morton K. Yonts for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. Thos. E. Rhodes, Mr. Paul D. Miller, Mr. Charles Henry Butler, Mr. John A. Kratz, Mr. George L. Shearer, and Mr. McCready Sykes for the respondent.

Second National Bank of Saginaw, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
323 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. A. Sutherland for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Josephine S. Scripps, as sole executrix, etc., Petitioner,
325 vs.
Robert Payne Scripps, as sole executor, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank H. Shaffer, Jr., Mr. Nathan L. Miller, Mr. John Weld Peck, Mr. Charles A. Brodek, and Mr. John H. Perry for the petitioner, and by Mr. Newton D. Baker for the respondents.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
326 vs.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. E. Wiley and Mr. Edward J. White for the petitioner.

Foreman Trust & Savings Bank, as Trustee, etc., et al., Petitioners,
327 vs.
City of Chicago.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard F. Bishop, Mr. John F. Caskey, and Mr. Geo. W. Schurman for the petitioners, and by Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson and Mr. Gotthard A. Dahlberg for the respondent.

State of Louisiana ex rel. Board of School Directors, etc., Petitioner,
328 vs.
Brooklyn Cooperage Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Peyton R. Sandoz for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. B. Dubuisson for the respondent.

Bridgeport Irrigation District, Petitioner,
329 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Ritchie, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. E. T. Burke, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Twin City Pipe Line Company, et al., Petitioners,
330 vs.
Harding Glass Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. P. Woods for the petitioners, and by Mr. Joseph R. Brown and Mr. James B. McDonough for the respondent.

The Annapolis Company, Petitioner,
331 vs.
Harry Wardman, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Camden R. McAtee for the petitioner.

Robert Proctor, Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
332 vs.
American Trust Company, Successor Manager.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Romney Spring and Mr. Wm. G. Thompson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edmund K. Arnold for the respondent.

The People of the State of New York, Petitioner,
335 vs.
Isaac G. Johnson & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert P. Beyer and Mr. Hamilton Ward for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Jay McKelvey, Mr. Morgan J. O'Brien, Mr. Martin Conboy, and Mr. Harry B. Chambers for the respondent.

Boston Pressed Metal Company, Petitioner,
337 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Friedman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. M. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

George Zarate, Petitioner,
338 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert Stanton Phillips for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Southern Railway Company in Kentucky,
Petitioner,
339 vs.
The Frankfort Distillery, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward P. Humphrey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas C. Mapother for the respondents.

Hudson River Navigation Company,
Petitioner,
340 vs.
Steamship "Cedarhurst" et al.;
Steamer "Trojan" et al.,
Petitioners,
341 vs.
Steamer Freeport Corporation.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace L. Cheyney for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. Curtis Rouse for the respondents.

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
342 vs.
Jack W. Hussey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Houts and Mr. H. N. Quigley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jesse W. Barrett for the respondent.

Levi Strauss Realty Company,
Petitioner,
343 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Altman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. N. Conner, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

States Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
344 vs.
Christian J. Berglann.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Erskine Wood for the petitioner.

George S. Hamilton, et al.,
Petitioners,
345 vs.
Atlantic Mortgage & Finance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. L. Nash for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. P. Adair and Mr. John C. Cooper, Jr., for the respondent.

John T. Clarke, et al., Petitioners,
346 vs.
Asmus Roysen, et al.;
Henry B. Pogson, Trustee, et al.,
Petitionerz,
347 vs.
Big Horn Power Company, et al.;
John T. Clark, et al., Petitioners,
348 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred R. Wright and Mr. O. Ellery Edwards for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. Q. Dier, Mr. J. C. James, and Mr. Bruce Scott for the respondents.

Hans Nelson,
Petitioner,
349 vs.
Puget Sound Navigation Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Winter S. Martin for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. B. Jones for the respondent.

A. James Eckert,
Petitioner,
351 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. R. Dewey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. A. H. Conner for the respondent.

V. Loewers Cambrinus Brewery Company,
Petitioner,
352 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, Individually and as Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur B. Hyman and Mr. Karl D. Loos for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. Norman D. Keller for the respondent.

Phoenix Assurance Company,
Petitioner,
353 vs.
R. O. Fleming, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Steiner, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. O. Mulkey for the respondents.

James Hamilton Lewis,
Petitioner,
354 vs.
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Andrew R. Sheriff for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wirt E. Humphrey and Mr. Edwin H. Cassels for the respondent.

I. G. Farbenindustrie, A. G., Assignee of Rudolf Wietzel, deceased, Petitioner, vs. Burritt Samuel Lacy.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Livingston Gifford and Mr. Wm. E. Warland for the petitioner, and by Mr. Julian S. Wooster for the respondent.
355	
Bruce M. Wood, et al., Petitioner, vs. Salt River Valley Water Users Association, Inc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Ray for the petitioners, and by Mr. Walter Bennett, Mr. John L. Gust, and Mr. Frank O. Smith for the respondent.
357	
Florida East Coast Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Mary C. Clark, as Administratrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. George C. Bedell for the respondent.
359	
Gasoline Products Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Champlin Refining Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Marsh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Horace G. McKeever, Mr. Harry O. Glasser, and Mr. Carl C. Jones for the respondent.
362-	

F. Wm. Lensing, Receiver, etc., Petitioner, 363 vs. J. Fred Rayzor.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. B. Stroud, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Newton Rayzor for the respondent.
Ex parte: L. M. Frantz, Petitioner, 364	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Russell S. Ritz for the petitioner.
O. R. Seagraves, Petitioner, 365 vs. Henry M. Wallace, et al.; O. R. Seagraves, Petitioner, 366 vs. Henry M. Wallace, et al.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clyde A. Sweeton for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Neethe and Mr. S. J. Brooks for the respondents.
The Bankers Reserve Life Company, Petitioner, 367 vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Kerr for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Lisle A. Smith for the respondent.

J. W. Alford,
Petitioner,
370 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thos. M. Foley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

William Wingert, Petitioner,
371 vs.
The President, Directors, and Company of the Hagerstown Bank, et al.;
Miller Wingert, Petitioner,
372 vs.
The President, Directors, and Company of the Hagerstown Bank, et al.;
Lewis P. Wingert, Petitioner,
373 vs.
The President, Directors, and Company of the Hagerstown Bank, et al.;
Martha A. Wingert, Petitioner,
374 vs.
The President, Directors, and Company of the Hagerstown Bank, et al.;
The Hagerstown Silk Company,
Petitioner,
375 vs.
The President, Directors, and Company of the Hagerstown Bank, et al.;
The Antietam Knitting Company,
Petitioner,
376 vs.
The President, Directors, and Company of the Hagerstown Bank, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Miller Wingert for the petitioners.

J. S. Cvitkovich, et al., Petitioners,
377 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Dore for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

The Farmers Bank of Mt. Pulaski, Illinois, et al., Petitioners,
379 vs.
A. P. Bickenbach, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence B. Stringer for the petitioners, and by Mr. William L. Patton for the respondent.

R. D. Spicer, et al., Petitioners,
380 vs.
The United States of America;
C. C. Stephens, Petitioner,
381 vs.
The United States of America;
B. M. Watkyns, Petitioner,
382 vs.
The United States of America.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward Hohfeld and Mr. Herbert W. Clark for the petitioners in No. 380; by Mr. John L. McNab for the petitioner in No. 381; by Mr. Joseph E. Davies and Mr. Ernest C. Carman for the petitioner in No. 382, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana),
Petitioner,
383 vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. L. Stephens, Mr. Frederick E. Brown, Mr. John R. Cochran, and Mr. Thos. Williamson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. John S. Flannery, and Mr. C. Bowdoin Craighill for the respondent.

Edward Kaminski,
Petitioner,
385 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick M. Miner for the petitioner, and by Mr. O. W. Dynes, Mr. F. W. Root, and Mr. A. C. Erdall for the respondent.

Chevrolet Motor Company,
Petitioner,
386 vs.
Ray V. Gladding.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Hudgins for the petitioner.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
388 vs.
Howard C. Firth.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Hobart for the petitioner, and by Mr. William J. Kraft for the respondent.

United States of America on the relation of Knickerbocker Insurance Company of New York, Successor, etc., Petitioner,
389 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Stanley Hinrichs, Mr. John Walsh and Mr. Frank S. Bright for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Frank Staley, and Mr. Thos. E. Rhodes for the respondent.

Pacent Reproducer Corporation, et al., Petitioners,
390 vs.
Western Electric Company, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. Houston Kenyon and Mr. Theodore S. Kenyon for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles Neave and Mr. Wm. R. Ballard for the respondents.

Charles D. Chisholm, trading as Chisholm Co., et al., Petitioners,
460 vs.
Benjamin Bernard Deitel.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. P. Goepel for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. P. Preble for the respondent.

The Jones Store Co., Kansas City Socialer Turnverein, et al., Petitioners,
391 vs.
Kansas City, Missouri.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maurice H. Winger for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. C. Petherbridge for the respondent.

Edwin C. Kudy, et al.,
Petitioners,
392 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. M. Doyle and Mr. Martin J. Brennan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Miles Tatham, et al., Petitioners,
394 vs.
Sacramento Suburban Fruit Lands Company;
John V. Kral, Petitioner,
395 vs.
Sacramento Suburban Fruit Lands Company;
C. A. Wagner, Petitioner,
396 vs.
Sacramento Suburban Fruit Lands Company;
Anton Handler, et al., Petitioners,
397 vs.
Sacramento Suburban Fruit Lands Company;
Harry C. Klaffenbach, et al.,
Petitioners,
398 vs.
Sacramento Suburban Fruit Lands Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ray T. Coughlin and Mr. Ralph H. Lewis for the petitioners.

Howe P. Cochran,
Petitioner,
399 vs.
James Couzens.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Friedman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Adrian P. Busick, Mr. Joseph E. Davies, Mr. Raymond M. Beebe, Mr. Clarence E. Wilcox, and Mr. Arthur J. Lacy for the respondent.

C. J. Farley and Company,
Petitioner,
401 vs.
Earl D. Stoll.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Julius H. Amberg for the petitioner.

Mailliard & Schmiedell, et al.,
Petitioners,
404 vs.
Pacific Steamship Company;
American-Hawaiian Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
418 vs.
Pacific Steamship Company, Owner, etc.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard S. Cosgrove, Mr. Robert S. Terhune, and Mr. William H. Gorham for the petitioners in No. 404; by Mr. Louis T. Hengstler and Mr. Frederick W. Dorr for the petitioner in No. 418; and by Mr. Hugh Montgomery for the respondent.

Moran Towing & Transportation Company,
Petitioner,
406 vs.
J. W. Higman Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the petitioner, and by Mr. Horace L. Cheyney, Mr. John A. McManus, and Mr. G. Noyes Slayton for the respondents.

Samuel Malinow, et al., Petitioners,
407 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. Palmer Ingram for the petitioners and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Stevens Hotel Company,
Petitioner,
408 vs.
Chicago Yacht Club, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Merrick and Mr. Tappan Gregory for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin W. Sims for the respondents.

Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
409 vs.
John Bonura & Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry McCall, Mr. Victor Leovy, Mr. Henry H. Chaffe, and Mr. Jas. Hy. Bruns for the petitioner, and by Mr. Burt W. Henry for the respondent.

Oscar Goldschlag,
Petitioner,
410 vs.
William F. Deegan, as Tenement House Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bernard Hershkoff for the petitioner and by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly, Mr. Hamilton Ward, and Mr. J. Joseph Lilly for the respondent.

Ida S. Graustein,
Petitioner,
415 vs.
Westminister National Bank, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts, Worcester County, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Ida S. Graustein, pro se.

John R. Smith, Petitioner,
417 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur I. Moulton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Nancy C. Williams, Petitioner,
419 vs.
The Order of United Commercial Travelers of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dwight L. Pendleton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Beverley R. Jouett for the respondent.

George S. Grueby, et al., Petitioners,
420 vs.
Theodora M. Christopher, Adm'x., et al.;
S. A. Grueby, et al., Petitioners,
421 vs.
Theodora M. Christopher, Adm'x., et al.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Foye M. Murphy for the petitioners in No. 420; by Mr. Dudley H. Dorr for the petitioners in No. 421; and by Mr. George Stanley Harvey for the respondents.

W. W. Custer, Petitioner,
422 vs.
Rob B. McCutchen, Substituted for F. M. Breshears, deceased, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James R. Bothwell for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. E. T. Burke, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Francisco Lopez Sanchez,
Petitioner,
423 vs.
Antonia Gautier y Borras.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nelson Cammans for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sidney P. Simpson, for the respondent.

Mattie Willis, now Mattie Rogers,
Petitioner,
424 vs.
Lonie Scott, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Guy H. Sigler and Mr. P. M. Jackson for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. F. Semple and Mr. Marion W. Reily for the respondent.

Group No. 1 Oil Corporation,
Petitioner,
425 vs.
James W. Bass, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer L. Bruce for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John G. Remey for the respondent.

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
426 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Co.;
Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
427 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Co.;
Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner,
428 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Co.;
Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
429 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Co.;
B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
430 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Co.;
Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner,
431 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Co.;
Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner,
432 vs.
Klein Chocolate Co.;
Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
433 vs.
Klein Chocolate Co.;
Est E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
434 vs.
Klein Chocolate Co.;
B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
435 vs.
Klein Chocolate Co.;
Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
436 vs.
Wilbur-Suchard Chocolate Co.;
Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
437 vs.
Wilbur-Suchard Chocolate Co.;

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the petitioners, and by Mr. A. Allen Woodruff and Mr. Wm. Clarke Mason for the respondents.

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
438 vs.
Wilbur-Suchard Chocolate Co.;
Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner,
439 vs.
York Chocolate Co.;
Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
440 vs.
York Chocolate Co.;
B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
441 vs.
York Chocolate Co.

Floy P. Baldwin,
Petitioner,
445 vs.
Iowa State Traveling Men's Association.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. W. Price, Mr. James Beery and Mr. F. W. Lehmann, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. M. Parsons for the respondent.

Sarah Powers, et al.,
Petitioners,
446 vs.
The New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald M. Hamilton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Leslie Nichols and Mr. Alfred Clum for the respondents.

L. J. A. Petree,
Petitioner,
450 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles T. Cates, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John H. McEvers, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court, after entertaining motions for admission to the bar and other motions noticed for today, will adjourn.

The Court will meet upon Monday next, October 13, and upon that day it will announce orders and receive such motions as may be submitted, and will then adjourn from that day until Monday, October 20, when arguments in cases especially set and cases on the regular docket will be commenced. The Court will thus be enabled to devote time during the next two weeks to the disposition of the petitions for writs of certiorari which were submitted to-day.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, October 13th next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, It is ordered that F. Cadmus Damrell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gustave Miller, It is ordered that Joseph Rousman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Hostetler, It is ordered that Noah S. Amstutz, Esquire, of Valparaiso, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis R. Mehlinger, It is ordered that David Eustace Henderson, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Neil Burkinshaw, It is ordered that William B. O'Connell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard Cecil Kilpatrick, It is ordered that Irving Morris Engel, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Hill, It is ordered that Maxwell W. Wells, Esquire, of Orlando, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. K. Berry Peterson, It is ordered that Irving A. Jennings, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Vallance, It is ordered that Thomas Marshall, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank W. Mondell, It is ordered that James Gillmore Leovy, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank W. Mondell, It is ordered that John W. Fisher, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward Stafford, It is ordered that Guy M. Page, Esquire, of Burlington, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Russell Bowen, It is ordered that Brice Clagett, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Broad River Power Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. State of South Carolina ex rel. John M. Daniel, Attorney General.

528, October Term, 1929.

On consideration of the petition for rehearing filed herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted and the case is assigned for reargument on Monday, November 24, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

In re George F. Curtis.

Order.

It having been shown to the Court that George F. Curtis, of Washington, District of Columbia, a member of the bar of this Court, has been disbarred from the practice of the law by the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia,

And it appearing that by order of June 2, 1930, this Court suspended the said George F. Curtis from the practice of the law in this Court and directed that the Clerk of this Court send to the said Curtis notice to show cause, on or before Monday, October 6, 1930, why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court,

And it further appearing that the Clerk, on June 4, 1930, did send to the said Curtis the notice to show cause and certified copy of the order of June 2, 1930;

And the return day of said notice to show cause having passed and the said Curtis having failed to make any return or answer to said notice to show cause.

It is now here ordered that the said George F. Curtis be, and he is hereby, disbarred, and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice in this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Arizona, Complainant,
—, Original. vs.
The State of California, State of Nevada, State of Utah, State of New Mexico, State of Colorado, State of Wyoming, and Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the bill of complaint in this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, January 5, 1931.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Wyoming, Complainant,
—, Original. vs.
The State of Colorado.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the bill of complaint in this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, January 5, 1931.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Vermont, Complainant,
3, Original. vs.
The State of New Hampshire.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a stipulation to amend the answer in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Vermont,
Complainant,
3, Original. vs.
The State of New Hampshire.

On consideration of the motion of the Commissioners for leave to file the transcript of proceedings, together with the exhibits before the Commissioners in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that the said transcript and exhibits be filed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Vermont, 3, Original. The State of New Hampshire.	Complainant, vs.	On consideration of the motion of the complainant for an order directing the defendant to file its transcript of proceedings and testimony and all of its exhibits herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the defendant is hereby ordered to file the said transcript, testimony and exhibits on or before November 1, 1930.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Vermont, 3, Original. The State of New Hampshire.	Complainant, vs.	On consideration of the motion for the appointment of a Special Master in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that Edmund F. Trabue, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, appointed Special Master in this cause. The Master is directed to make special findings of fact and conclusions of law, and to submit the same to this Court with all convenient speed, together with his recommendations for a decree; he shall accord to the parties a full hearing on all questions in the cause, whether of fact or of law, and shall base his findings and recommendations on the entire record as heretofore made and this day ordered to be filed in this Court. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Special Master shall be subject to consideration, revision, or approval by the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Louisiana, 8, Original The State of Mississippi.	Complainant, vs.	It is now here ordered by the Court that the exceptions to the report of the Special Master in this cause be filed, and the case is assigned for hearing on

Monday, January 5, next. It is also ordered that brief for the defendant shall be filed three weeks prior to the date of argument and that of the complainant one week prior to that date.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
12, Original. vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

It is now here ordered by the Court that this cause be, and it is hereby, set for hearing on Monday, January 5, 1931, on the complainant's exceptions to the report of the Special Master.

The parties are directed to file an abstract of the evidence in this case on or before November 15, 1930, and briefs for each party are directed to be filed on or before December 1, 1930. Reply briefs, if any, may be filed on or before December 15, 1930.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Vermont Loan & Trust Company,
Appellant,
26 vs.
W. D. Gillis, as Attorney General of the State of Idaho.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho in this cause be reversed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill of complaint on the ground set forth in the stipulation of the parties.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New World Life Insurance Company,

Appellant,

27 vs.

W. D. Gillis, as Attorney General of the State of Idaho.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho in this cause be reversed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill of complaint on the ground set forth in the stipulation of the parties.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Go-Bart Importing Co., et al.,

Petitioners,

111 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 24 next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana) et al.,

Appellants,

378 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 12, 1931.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States, Petitioner,
56 vs.
Swift and Company;
The Pottstown Iron Company, Petitioner,
113 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to advance the case of United States vs. Swift & Company, No. 56, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for hearing immediately following the case of United States vs. Iron Cap Copper Co., No. 43.

The order of this Court of June 2, 1930, advancing the case of Pottstown Iron Co. vs. The United States, No. 113, for hearing immediately following case No. 43 is amended, and case No. 113 is assigned for hearing immediately following case No. 56.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
231 vs.
Chicago Railway Equipment Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument immediately following No. 23, Charles H. Stange vs. The United States.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Annette Aiken, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
69 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument immediately following No. 231, Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue vs. Chicago Railway Equipment Co.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. P. Brown & Sons Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
115 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument immediately following No. 69, Aiken, Adm'x., etc. vs. Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Bond & Mortgage Company
and Trianon, Inc.,
210 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument immediately following No. 29, White v. Johnson.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin,
et al.,
Appellants,
464 vs.
W. C. Maxcy, as Receiver of the
Washburn Water Works Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, November 24 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Marshall L. Mott,
Petitioner,
78 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument immediately following No. 21, United States v. Equitable Trust Co., et al.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,

112 vs.

Edward Benz.

ORDER.

It is now here ordered by the Court that this case be, and it is hereby, advanced and assigned for hearing on Monday, November 24 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Indian Motocycle Company,

5 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to amend the certificate in this case,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Franc-Strohmenger & Cowan, Inc.,
Petitioner,

9 vs.

Baro Forchheimer, doing business under the name and style of B. Forchheimer & Company, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the petitioner have filed a motion to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Franc-Strohmenger & Cowan, Inc.,
Petitioner,
9 vs.
Baro Forchheimer, doing business under the name and style of B. Forchheimer & Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion of Bachrach Co., Inc., Hut Neckwear Co., McCurrach Organization, Inc., I. Isaac & Co., and Kramer-Brandeis, Inc., for leave to intervene in this Court as parties respondent in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Standard Oil Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
545, October Term, 1928.
City of Marysville, et al.

On consideration of the motion for an order interpreting the decision of this Court and directing form of mandate,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Abie State Bank,
Appellant,
63 vs.
Arthur J. Weaver, as Governor of the State of Nebraska, et al.

On consideration of the suggestions of diminution of the record and motions for writs of certiorari herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Raymond H. Moore,
Petitioner,
265 vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion for the consideration of the petition for certiorari in this cause on the printed records as filed,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph B. Straton, Raymond Fleshman and Randolph Bias, Special Commissioners of the Circuit Court of Mingo County, West Virginia,
137 vs.
Andy New, Jr., Trustee in Bankruptcy of Hall Branch Coal Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion to bring up the entire record and cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, Petitioner,
67 vs.
Northern Pacific Railroad Company, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respondents have filed a motion to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with directions to set aside its order for the issuance of a peremptory writ of mandamus and to dismiss the petition for writ of mandamus.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes,

Fred J. Elser, as Special Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
133 vs.
Asia Banking Corporation.

On consideration of the motion of the respondent to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.
Ex Parte: Adele T. Salisbury,
Petitioner.

On consideration of the motions for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus and for leave to proceed further herein in forma pauperis,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Peter Manke,
Petitioner,
187 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Peter Manke,
Petitioner,
187 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, Denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

H. Ely Goldsmith,
Petitioner,
190 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

H. Ely Goldsmith,
Petitioner,
190 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph S. Kalasanckas,
Petitioner,
220 vs.
Frank T. Hines, Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph S. Kalasanckas,

Petitioner,

220 vs.

Frank T. Hines, Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ferigus Marceaux,

Petitioner,

403 vs.

Police Jury of Vermillion Parish.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ferigus Marceaux,

Petitioner,

403 vs.

Police Jury of Vermillion Parish.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals, First Circuit, State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeal, First Circuit, State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph F. Fitzgerald and Mary A. Fitzgerald, Petitioners, 469 vs. The Union Central Life Insurance Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph F. Fitzgerald and Mary A. Fitzgerald, Petitioners, 469 vs. The Union Central Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Walter E. Carr, Director of Immigration of the United States for the Los Angeles District No. 31, Petitioner, 125 vs. Mateo Zaja.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for hearing immediately following case No. 92, Demetrius Philippides vs. Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of New York.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America ex rel. Costas Cateches, Petitioner,
336 vs.
Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for hearing immediately following case No. 125, Walter E. Carr, Director of Immigration, etc., vs. Mateo Zaja.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Concordia Insurance Company of Milwaukee, Petitioner,
278 vs.
School District No. 98 of Payne County, State of Oklahoma.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for hearing on Monday, January 12 next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Royal Insurance Company, Ltd., Petitioner,
279 vs.
School District No. 98 of Payne County, State of Oklahoma.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for hearing on Monday, January 12 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

National Fire Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
280 vs.
School District No. 98 of Payne County, State of Oklahoma.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for hearing on Monday, January 12 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fire Association of Philadelphia,
Petitioner,
281 vs.
School District No. 98 of Payne County, State of Oklahoma.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for hearing on Monday, January 12 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dora Wenglinsky,
Petitioner,
289 vs.
John L. Zurbrick, District Director of Immigration, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dora Wenglinsky,

Petitioner,

289 vs.

John L. Zurbrick, District Director of Immigration, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan with directions to sustain the writ of habeas corpus.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Seth M. Milliken, Gerrish H. Milliken and Harold A. Hatch, Executors of the Estate of Seth M. Milliken, deceased,

Petitioners,

87 vs.

The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harry F. Waite, Petitioner,

103 vs.

The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Various Items of Personal Property, etc., The Waterloo Distilling Corporation, et al., Petitioners,
114 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
129 vs.
Sybil Whitehouse.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hilary Halbert, Jr., Dorothy Halbert Hubble, Mildred Halbert, a minor, etc., et al., Petitioners,
141 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Rich Halbert, a minor, by Fred P. Halbert, Guardian, ad Litem, Petitioner,
142 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Vernon Sidney Halbert, a minor, by Benjamin F. Halbert, Guardian, ad Litem, Petitioner,
143 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sidney E. Halbert, a minor, by Sidney Seth Halbert, Guardian, ad Litem, Petitioner,
144 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Rose Peers Pickernoll, Mabel Peers White and Amelia Peers Alden,
Petitioners,
145 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lulu M. Elliott, Sophie M. Elliott, Carolyn M. Elliott, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
146 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary Barichio Petit, Norris Petit and Ellis A. Petit, et al.,
Petitioners,
147 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dewey Barichio and Leda E. Barichio, Romie D. Barichio, et al., Petitioners,
148 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edna May Elliott, Ruth G. Elliott, William H. Elliott, et al., Petitioners,
149 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chas. G. Elliott, Jr., Anna Marie Elliott, Henry Elliott, et al., Petitioners,
150 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Agnes Rubens, Louise Henry Peterson, Mary Henry Hagen, et al., Petitioners,
151 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Virginia Walkowsky, Alvin Walkowsky, Catherine Walkowsky, et al., Petitioners,
152 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lizzie Rolfson, Alvin Smith, Eugene Smith, et al., Petitioners,
153 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary Francis Provoe, Laura M. Brown, Frank M. Provoe, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 154

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. H. E. Martin and W. H. Porter. 155

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward A. Pagel, as Administrator of the Estate of Jacob E. Hallbom, Decedent, Petitioner, vs. Selma Hallbom. 176

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Farbwerke vormals Meister Lucius & Bruning, et al., etc., Petitioners,

179 vs.

Chemical Foundation, Inc., E. I. duPont de Nemours & Co., etc., et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Farbwerke vormals Meister Lucius & Bruning, Petitioner,

180 vs.

E. I. duPont de Nemours & Co., and Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of the United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Deutsche Gold & Silber Scheide Anstalt vorm. Roessler, Petitioner,

181 vs.

E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co. and Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of the United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Badische-Anilin & Soda-Fabrik,
Petitioner,
182 vs.
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., and
Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of the
United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of the
United States,
Petitioner,
271 vs.
The Chemical Foundation, Inc. and
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property
Custodian,
Petitioner,
272 vs.
Farbwerks Vormals Meister Lucius &
Brunning, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian,

Petitioner,

273 vs.

Deutsche Gold & Silber Scheide Anstalt Vorm. Roessler, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian,

Petitioner,

274 vs.

Badische Anilin & Soda-Fabrik, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

199 vs.

Samuel F. Houston.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

202 vs.

Sallie H. Henry.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

203 vs.

William Hobart Porter and Andrew W. Porter, Executors of the Estate of William W. Porter, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Georgia, Petitioner,

205 vs.

John W. Grant.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Georgia,

Petitioner,

206 vs.

John W. Grant and Annie Inman Grant.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

231 vs.

Chicago Railway Equipment Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward F. Flynn, as Executor of the Estate of Edward L. Flynn, deceased,

Petitioner,

235 vs.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alvis Maynard, Administrator of Mary A. Ronan, deceased,
Petitioner,
239 vs.
W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Nancy Jane Varney and Pricy A. Varney.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John B. Varney,
Petitioner,
240 vs.
W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Nancy Jane Varney and Pricy A. Varney.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. M. Smith and A. B. Scott,
Petitioners,
241 vs.
W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Nancy Jane Varney and Pricy A. Varney.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. C. Rutherford,
Petitioner,
242 vs.
W. R. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Nancy Jane Varney and Percy A. Varney.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States,
Petitioner,
252 vs.
Artemus C. Wells, et al., Executors of the Estate of John W. Wells.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Standard Marine Insurance Company, Ltd.
Petitioner,
261 vs.
Scottish Metropolitan Assurance Company, Ltd.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Maas & Waldstein Company,
Petitioner,
263 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bonwit Teller & Company,
Petitioner,
282 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
288 vs.
Thompson Oil & Gas Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hannah M. Smith, Administratrix of the Estate of Owen P. Smith,

Petitioner,

315 vs.

Springdale Amusement Park, Limited, Paul M. Williams and Gerald Brown.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Roberts Sash & Door Company,

Petitioner,

97 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jeff P. Nix,

Petitioner,

98 vs.

Henry Sternberg, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Jeff P. Nix, Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Adam Schumann Associates, Inc., Petitioner, vs. The City of New York. 99

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Riverside & Dan River Cotton Mills, Inc., Petitioner, vs. The United States. 100

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

York Safe & Lock Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 101

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Graniteville Manufacturing Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

208 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

National Equipment Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

209 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States ex rel. Edmund F. Leland,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

232 vs. to the Court of Appeals of the

J. R. McCarl, Comptroller General of the United States and David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mattie Howard, Petitioner, vs. Odie O. Owens. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

107

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

T. H. McCarthy, Eleanor McCarthy and Joseph McCarthy, as administrator of the Estate of Ethel C. McCarthy, deceased, Petitioners, vs. Bloedel Donovan Lumber Mills. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

110

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George A. Stewart, as Trustee, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Nebraska Tire & Rubber Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

117

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary Burnley Wilson Christian and Jane Hughes Wilson, by Frank P. Christian, Jr., guardian ad litem, Petitioners, vs. Richard Baxter Wilson's Executors and others. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

118

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

E. Massagli, doing business as San Francisco Concrete Co., etc., Petitioner, vs. T. I. Butler Co., J. S. Guerin and Stephen I. Guerin, copartners, etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

119

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. R. Demory Investment Co., Petitioner, vs. John P. Haese, Trustee. — On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

120

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John Davis,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

121 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Tolowa Royalties, Inc. and Crude of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

Oil Royalties Corporation.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Molasses Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

122 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Black Hardward Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

123 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

David Burnet, Commissioner of of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William J. Robb, Jr. and Guaranty Trust Company of New York, Executors of the will of William J. Robb, deceased,

Petitioners,

127 vs.

Noxon Chemical Products Co., Inc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles R. S. Leckie and Archie H. Ormond, as Receivers of the Noxon Chemical Products Co., Inc.,

Petitioners,

128 vs.

Noxon Chemical Products Co., Inc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Leonard Daniel Ingram,

Petitioner,

130 vs.

Philip A. Lewis, Minerva Jones and Citizens National Bank of Muskogee, Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Leonard Daniel Ingram,

Petitioner,

188 vs.

Carter W. Wesley, Jasper A. Atkins, The First National Bank of Houston, Texas, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Hughes.

George B. Davis, Bankrupt,

Petitioner,

132 vs.

National Surety Company, L. L. Lowry and Frank F. McNeel.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fred J. Elser, as special administrator of the estate of Henry W. Elser, deceased, Petitioner,

133 vs.

Asia Banking Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Can Company, a corporation,
Petitioner,
135 vs.
Mrs. Theodora Ryan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway Company, a corporation,
Petitioner,
171 vs.
Cecile S. Cole.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
284 vs.
Charles C. Stewart.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Board of County Commissioners of
Rogers County, Oklahoma,

Petitioner,

136 vs.

Bristow Battery Company, Drumright Hotel Company, Sapulpa Motor Co., etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Texas Company, a Corporation,

Petitioner,

156 vs.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry Seinfel, Henry Greene and
Celia S. Green,

Petitioners,

157 vs.

Theodore B. Hennenlotter, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Henry Green, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. D. Clay, Petitioner, vs. Mobile & Ohio Railroad Company.

158

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Salisbury Transportation Company, Petitioner, vs. Stark Electric Railroad Company.

162

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Flora Whitebird, Robert Allen Whitebird, a minor and Helen Irene Whitebird, a minor, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. The Eagle-Picher Lead Company and Hunt Mining Company, et al.

163

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Czarnikow-Rionda Company,

Petitioner,

164 vs.

United States of America, Owner of the Steamship "Lake Canaveral."

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hugh McElvogue,

Petitioner,

167 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William J. Brown,

Petitioner,

168 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lila Longson, Petitioner, vs. David Belasco. 169

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pillsbury Flour Mills Company, Petitioner, vs. Interlake Steamship Company. 170

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Emil E. Passailaigue, Petitioner, vs. Walter I. Herron, et al. 172

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Stanley Securities Company,
Petitioner,
173 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Abraham M. Ellis,
Petitioner,
174 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Weed & Brother, a corporation,
Petitioner,
175 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company,

Petitioner,

177 vs.

Frank Russo, Administrator of the Estate of Tony Campanion, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company,

Petitioner,

178 vs.

Frank Russo, Administrator of the Estate of Tony Campanion, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

M. P. Mathis,

Petitioner,

184 vs.

J. A. Ligon, J. L. Mainard, J. D. Garner, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary E. Little, Executrix of the
Estate of G. R. Little, deceased,
Petitioner,
185 vs.
Harwood Keaton, Receiver of the First
National Bank of Barnsdall, Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Norfolk and Western Railway Company,
Petitioner,
186 vs.
F. L. Aylor, Trading as Clarke
Milling Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It isnow here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
189 vs.
Mamie F. Jolly, Administrator of
Henry C. Jolly, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph Reynolds, Lina McCoy Morris,
Napoleon Reynolds, etc., et al., Petitioners,
191 vs.
Harry E. Schmidt, Josey Oil Company,
J. H. Woods, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pan American Petroleum and Transport Company, Petitioner,
192 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Star Metal Mfg. Co., et al., Petitioners,
194 vs.
The Allen Filter Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Packard Motor Car Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to

196 vs. the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Blanche F. Coughlin, On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court

197 vs. of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Southwestern Bell Telephone Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John W. Gamble,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

198 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Herbert S. Daniel, as Receiver of the of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Peters Trust Company, Bankrupt.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Daniel J. Halpin, as Trustee, etc., Petitioner, vs. Savannah River Electric Company. 200

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Elizabeth Miller Bowman, Petitioner, vs. Pennsylvania Railroad Company. 201

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States ex rel. H. Wendell Endicott and Eliot Spalding, as Executors of the Estate of Henry B. Endicott, deceased, Petitioners, vs. Andrew W. Mellon, as Secretary of the Treasury, et al. 204

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Abby F. Means,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to

207 vs. the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Quick Action Ignition Company, et al., On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioners, to the United States Circuit Court

211 vs. of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

The Maytag Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James J. Mars, Executor of the Estate

of Lusanna Brink, deceased, et al., On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioners, to the United States Circuit Court

212 vs. of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

Daniel A. McDougal, Leonard O. Lytle,

Ada Jack, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Osburn California Corporation,

Petitioner,

213 vs.

Galen M. Welch, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Sixth District of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bank Savings Life Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

214 vs.

Nellie E. Butler.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Elsie Aronstein,

Petitioner,

215 vs.

The New York Central Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States,

Petitioner,

216 vs. On petition for writ of certiorari to

Dorothy Whitney Elmhirst, nee Straight, the Court of Claims.

Executrix of the Estate of Willard

Straight, deceased.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Percy W. Pickford and Frank M. Salisbury,

Trustees and Harry Kaufman, On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioners, to the Court of Appeals of the

221 vs. District of Columbia.

E. Hilton Jackson, Receiver.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harry M. Kaufman, Leo Baum and Morton

H. Goldenberg, On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioners, to the Court of Appeals of the

222 vs. District of Columbia.

E. Hilton Jackson, Receiver.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

223 vs.

First Trust & Savings Bank of Miami, Fla.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Higman Towing Company, Owner of Tug "Lutcher Brown,"

Petitioner,

224 vs.

S. S. "Southseas" and Petroleum Navigation Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arthur Hind,

Petitioner,

225 vs.

Jesse W. Clark, Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States for the 21st District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frischer & Co., Inc., Transatlantic Clock and Watch Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Tariff Commission and Bakelite Corporation, Abse Brothers, et al.

226 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Will Friedrichsen, Petitioner, vs. Guaranty Trust Company of New York, as Trustee, et al.

227 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Will Friedrichsen, Petitioner, vs. Guaranty Trust Company of New York, as Trustee, et al.

228 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary T. Comage, Margaret B. Curry,
Mary E. Bemis, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
229 vs.
Masonic Cemetery Association, William C. Hassler, William P. Filmer, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lee Calvin Moore,
Petitioner,
230 vs.
W. T. Pate, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
Peter Friday and Herman F. Cardwell,
Petitioners,
233 vs.
Lurline J. Bell, as Administratrix of John M. Bell, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Barde Steel Products Corporation,

Petitioner,

234 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Maryland Casualty Company,

Petitioner,

236 vs.

Nannie L. Massey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sacramento Suburban Fruit Lands Company, Petitioner,

238 vs.

H. A. Lindquist and Selma A. Lindquist.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Anahma Realty Corporation,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

243 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

David Burnet, Commissioner of of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Forrest Nash Robertson,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

244 vs. to the Supreme Court of the

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific State of Minnesota.

Railway Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Luther H. Reichelderfer, William B.

Ladue, Herbert B. Crosby, Commissioners,

etc., et al., Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

245 vs. to the Court of Appeals of the

American Security and Trust Company, District of Columbia.

Edward B. McLean, Trustee, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Luther H. Reichelderfer, William B.
Ladue, Herbert B. Crosby, Commissioners, etc., et al., Petitioners,
246 vs.
Christian Heurich.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Luther H. Reichelderfer, Herbert B.
Crosby, John C. Gotwals, etc., et al., etc., Petitioners,
414 vs.
William W. Dodge.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
247 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,

Petitioner,

248 vs.

Ida M. Fultz, Administratrix of the Estate of Solomon S. Fultz, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company,

Petitioner,

249 vs.

Ida M. Fultz, Administratrix of the Estate of Solomon S. Fultz, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dora I. Nickman,

Petitioner,

250 vs.

The New York Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. Perez Rubio,
Petitioner,
vs.
Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

251

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

First National Bank of Biloxi, Mississippi, and Maryland Casualty Company of Baltimore, Maryland,
Petitioners,
vs.
Board of Supervisors of Harrison County, Mississippi.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

253

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arthur Curtiss James,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

254

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arthur Curtiss James and George Notman,
as Executors of the Estate of Ellen S.
James, deceased, Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to
255 vs. the Court of Claims.
The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court
257 vs. of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.
George R. Smith.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William T. May, William M. Acker, and
Charles H. Acker, On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioners, to the United States Circuit Court
258 vs. of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.
Benjamin Marbury, Nellie Marbury,
Lila Marbury, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

E. C. Atkins & Company,

Petitioner,

259 vs.

Harry Dunn, as Auditor of Marion County, Indiana, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Eunice V. Avery,

Petitioner,

260 vs.

Catherine Vernon, Julia Meinberg and W. Gwynn Gardiner, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William J. Briley, Max Goldsmith, Albert A. Hoffman, et al.,

Petitioners,

262 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Raymond H. Moore, Petitioner, vs. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company. 265

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. D. D. Covington. 266

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Panhard Oil Corporation, Substituted Assignee of George A. Haws, Petitioner, vs. Societe Anonyme Des Anciens Etablissements Panhard & Levassor. 267

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William C. Newman,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

268 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

David Burnet, Commissioner of of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Piggly Wiggly Corporation, On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court

269 vs. of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Jitney Jungle Corporation.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

F. W. Woolworth Company, On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court

270 vs. of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

R. E. Davis.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

entral Vermont Transportation
ompany, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
75 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
he barge "Hartford" and Steam Tug of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
Dunmore", their tackle, etc., et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

he Atlantic Refining Company,
Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to
76 vs. the Court of Claims.
he United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

iamond Shoe Company,
Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
77 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
avid Burnet, Commissioner of of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
nternal Revenue.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Clinchfield Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

283 vs.

Elice H. Dunn, Administratrix of the Estate of Milledge D. Hunnicut.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company,

Petitioner,

285 vs.

Weil Brothers.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company,

Petitioner,

286 vs.

Southern Coal, Coke & Mining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court, 4th District, State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court, 4th District, State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Collector of Internal Revenue
of the Philippine Islands,
Petitioner,
287 vs.
The Manila Railroad Company of
the Philippine Islands.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John H. Class, Trustee in Bankruptcy of
J. Willard Mixon, Individually, and as
Surviving Partner of Cadigan, Mixon
& Co., Petitioners,
291 vs.
John Cumming, Jr.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, ex
relatione Stanton K. Livingston,
Petitioner,
292 vs.
Frank T. Hines, Director of the
United States Veterans Bureau.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fred E. Suits, Wilbur J. Holleman,
W. J. Peters, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
293 vs.
Magnolia Petroleum Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry Vogt Machine Co.,
Petitioner,
294 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bellaire, Benwood and Wheeling Ferry Company,
Petitioner,
295 vs.
The Interstate Bridge Company, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pierce and Eula Pierce, his wife,
Sears and Lulu Sears, his wife,
Petitioners,
vs.
Idaho Land Company and
tional Mortgage Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

In consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to ited States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the of counsel thereupon had, it is now ordered by this Court that petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

iver Levee District,
Petitioner,
vs.
ams Dredging Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

In consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to ed States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the of counsel thereupon had, it is now ordered by this Court that petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Iowa,
Petitioner,
vs.
ed States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

In consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now ered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby,

per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sam E. Finley,

Petitioner,

300 vs.

MacDougald Construction Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary Louise Thomas, a minor by Annie Thomas, her guardian,

Petitioner,

301 vs.

Sid Jones, Mrs. Sid Jones, Mrs. Lee Jones, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Marco Colpo,

Petitioner,

302 vs.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Josefa Aguayo Casals,

Petitioner,

303 vs.

Elvira Juana Manuela Joaquina Garcia Fernandez.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The LaMesa, Lemon Grove and Spring Valley Irrigation District,

Petitioner,

305 vs.

City of San Diego.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

B. Altman & Company,

Petitioner,

308 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert Proctor, Receiver of New England Oil Refining Co., et al., Petitioner, vs. First National Bank of Boston.

309 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Miller & Vidor Lumber Company, Petitioner, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

310 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

National Brake & Electric Company, Petitioner, vs. Niels A. Christensen and Allis-Chalmers Company.

311 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles Burnham Squire, Petitioner,
312 vs.
H. May Paige.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sigvard B. Johnson, Petitioner,
314 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Associated Bill Posters of the United States and Canada, et al., Petitioners,
317 vs.
Wm. H. Rankin Co.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Associated Bill Posters of the United States and Canada, et al., Petitioners,

318 vs.

Charles A. Ramsey Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Denver and Salt Lake Railway Company, Petitioner,

319 vs.

Frank Lombardi.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Educational Films Corporation of America, Appellant,

350 vs.

Hamilton Ward, Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file out of time the statement as to jurisdiction in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

No. —
In Re Albert T. Patrick.

Leave was granted to file (1) exceptions to the report of the committee of the bar, (2) printed record of proceedings in the courts of the State of New York, (3) additional printed copies of brief before the committee of the bar, and (4) supplemental brief in support of exceptions to the report of the committee of the bar, on or before Monday, November 3.

No. —, Original.
Ex parte H. Ely Goldsmith, Petitioner.

The motions for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Ely Goldsmith pro se.

C. A. Jungst, E. K. Whitney, and Bertha Kinney,

Appellants,

70 vs.

H. C. Baldridge, Governor of the State of Idaho, W. D. Gillis, Attorney General, etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the appellants have filed a motion to dismiss the appeal in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Foreman Trust & Savings Bank, as Trustee, Albert Crosby, Alma Jevne, et al., Appellants, vs. City of Chicago.

327

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the appeal in this cause be dismissed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, each party to pay its own costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Foreman Trust & Savings Bank, as Trustee, Albert Crosby, Alma Jevne, et al., Appellants, vs. City of Chicago.

327

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be dismissed;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, et al., Appellants, vs. Atlanta, Birmingham & Coast Railroad Company.

88

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Elmer B. Collins, and Mr. Edward M. Reidy for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. F. B. Crier, Mr. John A. Hynds, and Mr. Robert C. Alston for the appellee in opposition thereto.

J. M. Near, Appellant, 91 vs. The State of Minnesota ex rel. Floyd B. Olson, County Attorney, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Weymouth Kirkland and Mr. T. E. Latimer for the appellant.
A. Neustadt, et al., Appellants, 102 vs. Coline Oil Company, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred E. Suits and Mr. R. L. Disney for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. George M. Green, Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, and Mr. E. E. McInnis for the appellees in opposition thereto.
State of Nebraska ex rel., Beatrice Creamery Company, Appellant, 108 vs. Frank Marsh, The Secretary of State, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. S. Allen for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. C. A. Sorensen for the appellee in opposition thereto.
North Bend Stage Line, Inc., Appellant, 134 vs. John J. Denney, Director, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. K. Poe for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Hance H. Cleland, ~~and~~ John H. Dunbar, Mr. Raymond W. Clifford for the appellees in opposition thereto.
Thomas W. Fleming, Appellant, 159 vs. The State of Ohio.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander H. Martin for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Ray T. Miller and Mr. David Ralph Hertz for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Leonard J. Woodruff, et al., Appellants, vs. The City of Los Angeles.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Edward Keating for the appellants.
165	
State Board of Tax Commissioners, etc., Appellants, vs. Lafayette A. Jackson.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Ogden for the appellants.
183	
Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. Hal Norwood, Attorney General, etc., et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas B. Fryer and Mr. Edward J. White for the appellant.
193	
Columbus & Greenville Railway Company, et al., Appellants, vs. W. J. Miller, State Tax Collector, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Watkins and Mr. A. F. Gardner, Jr., for the appellants.
195	
Amanda D. Margis, Commissioner, etc., Appellant, vs. A. T. Bradford.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter H. Sloat and Mr. Stratton Shartel for the appellant.
217	
Nekoosa Edwards Paper Company, Appellant, vs. Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. R. Goggins and Mr. Theo. W. Brazeau for the appellant.
218	

John H. Drinkley, Appellant, vs. J. F. Massig, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred S. Jackson for the appellant and by Mr. William A. Smith and Mr. William C. Ralston for the appellees in opposition thereto.
319	
Harold C. Prideaux, Appellant, vs. Des Moines Joint Stock Land Bank.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold C. Prideaux, pro se, in support thereof, and by Mr. George Cosson for the appellee in opposition thereto.
237	
The American Oil Company, Appellant, vs. Josephine Metz, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin H. Brownley and Mr. George Henderson for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Walter C. Capper for the appellees in opposition thereto.
256	
The George E. Breece Lumber Company, et al., Appellants, vs. Rupert F. Asplund, State Comptroller, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence M. Botts for the appellants.
264	
Western Land & Reclamation Company, Appellant, vs. The Reclamation Board of the State of California, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eddy Knapp and Mr. Wm. H. Metson for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Stephen W. Downey, for the appellees, in opposition thereto.
290	

MONDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1900 - CONTINUED

George A. Caldwell, Appellant, vs. State of Louisiana.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry A. Curtis and Mr. Luther H. Hall for the appellant.
296	
Guy Spurrier, et al., Appellants, vs. Mitchell Irrigation District, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. Fitzgerald and Mr. L. L. Raymond for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. T. M. Morrow and Mr. William Morrow, for the appellees, in opposition thereto.
306	
Will Walker, et al., Appellants, vs. Lawrence Mensi, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. A. Metcalf for the appellants.
313	
John William McKissick, et al., Appellants, vs. Adolphus R. Talbot, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Lynn for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. Nelson C. Pratt and Mr. Isaac R. Ferguson, for the appellees, in opposition thereto.
316	
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred P. Thom, Mr. Edward S. Jouett, Mr. M. V. Richmond, Mr. Robert B. Tungstall, Mr. H. M. Quigley, and Mr. Alfred P. Thom, Jr., for the appellants.
333	

Hans Rees' Sons, Inc., Appellant, vs. State of North Carolina on the relation of Allen J. Maxwell, Commissioner, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis H. Porter and Mr. F. Carroll Taylor for the appellant.
Interstate Transit, Inc., Appellant, 358 vs. Dick Lindsey, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas L. Tallentire for the appellant.
Charles F. Noack, et al., Appellants, 361 vs. I. Zellerbach, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth and Mr. Roger O'Donnell for the appellants.
The Susquehanna Power Company, Appellant, 368 vs. State Tax Commission of Maryland.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. Clarke Mason and Mr. Fred R. Williams for the appellant.
The Susquehanna Power Company, Appellant, 369 vs. State Tax Commission of Maryland.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. Clarke Mason and Mr. Fred R. Williams for the appellant.
Standard Oil Company (Indiana), et al., Appellants, 378 vs. The United States of America.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis L. Stephens, Mr. Russell Wiles, Mr. Chester O. Swain, Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. Charles Heave, Mr. S. D. Ames, Mr. Drury W. Cooper, Mr. John B. Marsh, Mr. Frank L. Crawford, Mr. Walter F. Kirkbride, Mr. C. H. Dorr, Mr. W. H. Francis, Mr. James J. Cosgrove, Mr. S. A. Mitchell, Mr. Albert L. Hopkins, Mr. Oscar Sutro, Mr. Alfred S. Austrian, Mr. Earl B. Evans, Mr. Chas. J. Middleton, Mr. Francis I. Fallon, Mr. Frank M. Swacker, Mr. James H. Ball, Mr. Burton W. Musser, Mr. Thos. L. Mitchell, Mr. C. Schuyler Davis, Mr. J. Merrill Wright, and Mr. Harry E. Klein for the appellants.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana), Appellant, vs. The United States of America, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. L. Stephens and Mr. John R. Cochran for the appellant.
384	
Thomas M. Wampler, Appellant, vs. E. Lee Lecompte, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thos. M. Wampler for the appellant.
402	
The East Ohio Gas Company, Appellant, vs. The Tax Commission of Ohio, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. H. Doggett for the appellant.
453	
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, et al., Appellants, vs. W. G. Maxcy, as Receiver, etc., et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Emil C. Arnold and Mr. John W. Reynolds for the appellants.
464	
Etta M. Klein, former administratrix, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin B. Pettus for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Fred K. Dyar for the respondent.
387	
The United States, Petitioner, vs. Wyman, Partridge & Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank J. Altus for the respondent.
416	

Edward T. Bunn,
Petitioner,
vs.
State of Ohio.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rufus S. Day and Mr. W. E. Minshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gilbert Bettman, Mr. Frank R. Hubachek, and Mr. Alfred Clum for the respondent.

Mattie Wilmouth, as Administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
444 vs.
Southern Railway.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. J. Fulton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wirt P. Marks, Jr., for the respondent.

Florindo Luccioni and Paul Courbis,
Petitioners,
447 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roscoe M. Ewing for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Aaron Prussian,
Petitioner,
448 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter B. Milkman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The National City Bank of New York,
Petitioner,
452 vs.
Petrograd[illegible]
Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Garver for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick B. Campbell for the respondent.

Annie G. Phillips, et al.,
Petitioners,
455 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elkan Turk for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Morton K. Rothschild, Mr. Paul D. Miller, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Allin H. Pierce for the respondent.

City of Lake Worth,
Petitioner,
456 vs.
R. M. Grant & Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles D. Gould for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. J. L'Engle for the respondent.

Duquesne Steel Foundry Company,
Petitioner,
457 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. S. Moorhead for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John Henry McEvers, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Louis Goldstein,
Petitioner,
462 vs.
George M. Klages, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Julian C. Ryer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward M. Evarts for the respondent.

Daniel Reeves, Inc.,
Petitioner,
463 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, Individually, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elkan Turk and Mr. Herman Goldman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. S. Dee Hanson for the respondent.

The Ohio Galvanizing & Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
466 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Union C. DeFord, Mr. Wm. Marshall Bullitt, and Mr. N. A. Emery for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles W. Milner, Mr. Edw. P. Humphrey, and Mr. Louis Seelbach, Jr., for the respondent.

John I. Sapinkopf,
Petitioner,
468 vs.
The Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilson E. Tipple for the petitioner, and by Mr. George de Forest Lord for the respondent.

A. Stanley Copeland, Petitioner, 476 vs. James W. Higgins, Police Commissioner of Buffalo, New York.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Erie County, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by A. Stanley Copeland pro se.
E. E. Lutz, Petitioner, 480 vs. Gene Buck, as President, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Gano for the petitioner, and by Mr. Nathan Burkan and Mr. Maurice J. O'Sullivan for the respondent.
Oskar Korn, Petitioner, 481 vs. Gene Buck, as President, etc.: Oskar Korn, Petitioner, 482 vs. Gene Buck, as President, etc.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Gano for the petitioner, and by Mr. Nathan Burkan and Mr. Maurice J. O'Sullivan for the respondent.
Iowa State Insurance Company of Keokuk, Iowa, Petitioner, 496 vs. Grover Godwin, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the St. Louis Court of Appeals, State of Missouri, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. L. Cole and Mr. Samuel H. West for the petitioner.

The Chief Justice announced that the Court would adjourn until Monday next, to enable it to devote the remainder of the week to the disposition of petitions for writs of certiorari and jurisdictional statements submitted.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward M. Reidy, It is ordered that Alvord C. Devoe, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis B. Leech, It is ordered that Rollin W. Holbrook, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward M. Reidy, It is ordered that Henry C. Howard, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert A. Littleton, It is ordered that Vaughn Miller, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Jackson, It is ordered that George Stewart Law, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Jackson, It is ordered that A. L. Ashby, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis L. Mohundro, It is ordered that Shelby S. Roberts, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elwood H. Seal, It is ordered that Augustus S. Goodyear, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Webster Ballinger, It is ordered that Benjamin E. Seibert, Esquire, of Urbana, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Monte Appel, It is ordered that C. Stanley Perry, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace S. Whitman, It is ordered that Stevenson A. Williams, Esquire, of Bel Air, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis L. Mohundro, It is ordered that Robert Romero, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elwood H. Seal, It is ordered that Francis Michael Holt, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that John C. Farber, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wright Patman, It is ordered that Elmer Lewis Lincoln, Esquire, of Texarkana, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raphael M. O'Mara, It is ordered that George Z. Medalie, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Brice Clagett, It is ordered that W. Joseph Ford, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hodges, It is ordered that W. Theo. Woodward, Esquire, of DeLand, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hodges, It is ordered that Benj. B. Dowell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins, It is ordered that William Dale O'Brien, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that Francis L. Daily, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

—, Original. Ex parte: H. Ely Goldsmith, Petitioner. On consideration of the motions for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. M. Near, Appellant, vs. The State of Minnesota, ex rel. Floyd B. Olson, County Attorney, etc. 91

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

North Bend Stage Line, Inc.,
Appellant,
134 vs.
John C. Denney, Director, et al., etc.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Leonard J. Woodruff, et al.,
Appellants,
165 vs.
The City of Los Angeles.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Nekoosa Edwards Paper Company,
Appellant,
218 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The George E. Breece Lumber Co., et al.
Appellants,
264 vs.
Rupert F. Asplund, State Comptroller of the State of New Mexico.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Western Land & Reclamation Company,
Appellant,
290 vs.
The Reclamation Board of the State of California, et al.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Guy Spurrier, et al.,
Appellants,
306 vs.
Mitchell Irrigation District, et al.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Will Walker, et al.,
Appellants,
313 vs.
Lawrence Mensi, et al.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John William McKissick, et al.,
Appellants,
316 vs.
Adolphus R. Talbot, et al.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hans Rees' Sons, Inc.,
Appellant,
334 vs.
State of North Carolina on the relation of Allen J. Maxwell, Commissioner, etc.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Susquehanna Power Company,
Appellant,
368 vs.
State Tax Commission of Maryland.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Susquehanna Power Company,
Appellant,
369 vs.
State Tax Commission of Maryland.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State Board of Tax Commissioners of the State of Indiana, et al.,
Appellants,
183 vs.
Lafayette A. Jackson.

O R D E R.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Appellant,
93 vs.
Hal Norwood, Attorney General of the State of Arkansas, et al., etc., et al.

O R D E R.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Amanda D. Hargis, Commissioner, etc., Appellant, vs. A. T. Bardford.	O R D E R. In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
217	
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, et al.	O R D E R. In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
333	
Interstate Transit Inc., Appellant, vs. Dick Lindsey, County Court Clerk.	O R D E R. In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
358	
Charles F. Noack, et al., Appellants, vs. I. Zellerbach, et al.	O R D E R. In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
361	
Standard Oil Company (Indiana), et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America.	O R D E R. In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
378	
Standard Oil Company (Indiana), Appellant, vs. The United States of America, et al.	O R D E R. In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
384	
The East Ohio Gas Company, Appellant, vs. The Tax Commission of Ohio, et al.	O R D E R. In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
453	

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, et al., Appellants, 464 vs. W. G. Maxcy, as Receiver, etc., et al.	O R D E R. In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
Thomas M. Wampler, Appellant, 402 vs. E. Lee Lecompte, State Game Warden, etc., et al.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, November 24 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
The United States of America, et al., Appellants, 38 vs. Atlanta, Birmingham & Coast Railroad Company.	It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
Columbus & Greenville Railway Company, et al., Appellants, 195 vs. W. J. Miller, State Tax Collector, etc.	It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the motion to dismiss in this case be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
W. Neustadt, et al., Appellants, 102 vs. Coline Oil Company, W. A. Ledbetter, W. B. Johnson, et al., etc., et al.	Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. Neustadt, et al.,

Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

102 vs. State of Oklahoma.

Coline Oil Company, W. A. Ledbetter,

W. B. Johnson, et al., etc., et al.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State of Nebraska ex rel. Beatrice

Creamery Company, Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

108 vs. State of Nebraska.

Frank Marsh, The Secretary of State

of the State of Nebraska.

This case came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thomas W. Fleming,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

159 vs. State of Ohio.

The State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, statement as to jurisdiction, and motion of the appellee to dismiss the appeal herein,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thomas W. Fleming, Petitioner, vs. The State of Ohio. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

159

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John R. Brinkley, Appellant, vs. J. F. Massig, C. H. Ewing, G. R. Dean, et al., etc. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

219

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harold C. Prideaux, Appellant, vs. Des Moines Joint Stock Land Bank, a corporation. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota.

237

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The American Oil Company,

Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Appeals of

256 vs. the State of Maryland.

Josephine Metz and The Cumberland

and Westernport Transit Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, statement as to jurisdiction, and motion of appellee, The Cumberland and Westernport Transit Company, to dismiss the appeal herein;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George A. Caldwell, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

Appellant, State of Louisiana.

296 vs.

State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

V. Loewers Cambrinus Brewery Company, Order allowing certiorari.

Petitioner, The petition herein for a writ of cer-

352 vs. tiorari to the United States Circuit

Charles W. Anderson, Individually and Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

as Collector of Internal Revenue of is granted, the argument and briefs to

the United States. be limited to the question whether the petitioner is entitled to any deduction for obsolescence of its tangible property in the taxable years 1918 and 1919 under Sec. 234 (a) (7) of the Revenue Act of 1918. The case is advanced and assigned for hearing following No. 109, Burnet v. National Industrial Alcohol Co.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gasoline Products Company, Inc., Petitioner,
362 vs.
Champlin Refining Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted, the briefs and argument to be limited to the question whether the United States Circuit Court of Appeals erred in limiting the new trial to the question of damages.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Aaron Prussian, Petitioner,
448 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted, the briefs and argument to be limited to the question whether the indictment states an offense under the criminal code.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Second National Bank of Saginaw, Saginaw, Michigan, Trustee of the Estate of Wellington R. Burt, deceased, Petitioner,
323 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for hearing immediately following case No. 105, Taft Woolen Co. vs. The United States.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Boston Pressed Metal Company,
Petitioner,
337 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for hearing immediately following case No. 323, Second National Bank of Saginaw, Saginaw, Michigan, Trustee, etc. vs. The United States.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Daniel Reeves, Inc.,
Petitioner,
463 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, Individually, and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for hearing immediately following case No. 337, Boston Pressed Metal Company vs. The United States.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Columbus & Greenville Railway Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
195 vs.
W. J. Miller, State Tax-Collector, for the use of the Mississippi Levee District.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Twin City Pipe Line Company and Industrial Oil & Gas Company, Petitioners,

330 vs.

Harding Glass Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,

342 vs.

Jack W. Mussey.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. James Eckert, Petitioner,

351 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. W. Alford,

Petitioner,

370 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. W. Custer,

Petitioner,

422 vs.

Rob B. McCutchen, Substituted for F. M. Breshears, Deceased, United States Marshal for the District of Idaho.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Francisco Lopez Sanchez,

Petitioner,

423 vs.

Antonia Gautier y Borras.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

B. D. McCaughn, Collector,
Petitioner,
426 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Est. E. Lederer, Collector,
Petitioner,
427 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector,
Petitioner,
428 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
429 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
430 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner,
431 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector,
Petitioner,
432 vs.
Klein Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Est. E. Lederer, Collector,
Petitioner,
433 vs.
Klein Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Est. E. Lederer, Collector,
Petitioner,
434 vs.
Klein Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

B. D. McCaughn, Collector,
Petitioner,
435 vs.
Klein Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Est. E. Lederer, Collector,
Petitioner,
436 vs.
Wilbur-Suchard Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Est. E. Lederer, Collector,
Petitioner,
437 vs.
Wilbur-Suchard Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

B. D. McCaughn, Collector,
Petitioner,
438 vs.
Wilbur-Suchard Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector,
Petitioner,
439 vs.
York Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
440 vs.
York Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
441 vs.
York Chocolate Co.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Floyd P. Baldwin, Petitioner,
445 vs.
Iowa State Traveling Men's Association.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eight Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Etta M. Klein, former administratrix of the estate of Solomon Klein, deceased, etc., et al., Petitioners,
387 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States,
Petitioner,
416 vs.
Wyman, Partridge & Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Annie G. Phillips, Arthur L. Phillips, et al., Executors of the Estate of I. L. Phillips, deceased,
Petitioners,
455 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward Blanchard,
Petitioner,
320 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Garnett D. Ripley, Carter W. Wormeley
and Spotswood B. Hall,
Petitioners,
321 vs.
Howard Sutherland, Alien Property
Custodian of the United States, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Josephine S. Scripps, as sole executrix
of the last Will and Testament of James
J. Scripps, deceased, Petitioner,
325 vs.
Albert Payne Scripps, as sole executor
of the Last Will and Testament of
Edward W. Scripps, deceased, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
326 vs.
Chicago Rock Island and Pacific
Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State of Louisiana, ex rel. Board of
School Directors of the Parish of
St. Landry, Louisiana, Petitioner,
328 vs.
Brooklyn Cooperage Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bridgeport Irrigation District, a
Public Corporation,
Petitioner,
329 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Annapolis Company,
Petitioner,
331 vs.
Harry Wardman, Thomas P. Bones,
John H. Holmead, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert Proctor, Receiver of the New England Oil Refining Co., Petitioner, vs. American Trust Company, Successor Manager. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

332

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The People of the State of New York, Petitioner, vs. Isaac G. Johnson & Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

335

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George Zarate, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

338

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway Company in Kentucky,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

339 vs. to the Court of Appeals of the

The Frankfort Distillery, Incorporated, State of Kentucky.

et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hudson River Navigation Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

340 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Steamship "Cedarhurst", Steamer of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Freeport Corporation.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Steamer "Trojan," Hudson River

Navigation Company, On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court

341 vs. of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Steamer Freeport Corporation.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Levi Strauss Realty Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

343

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

States Steamship Company, Petitioner, vs. Christian J. Berglann. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

344

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George S. Hamilton and Margaret Hamilton, Petitioners, vs. Atlantic Mortgage & Finance Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

345

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1939 - CONTINUED

John T. Clarke, et al., Petitioners, vs. Asmus Boysen, et al.

346

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry B. Pogson, Trustee, et al., Petitioners, vs. Big Horn Power Company, et al.

347

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John T. Clarke, et al., Petitioners, vs. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

348

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hans Nelson,
Petitioner,
349 vs.
Puget Sound Navigation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Phoenix Assurance Company,
Petitioner,
353 vs.
R. [illegible] Fleming, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James Hamilton Lewis,
Petitioner,
354 vs.
Canadian Pacific Railway Company and Mary A. Braun, Individually, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

I. G. Farbenindustrie, A. G.,
Assignee of Rudolf Wietzel, deceased,
Petitioner,
355 vs.
Burritt Samuel Lacy.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bruce M. Wood, et al.,
Petitioners,
357 vs.
Salt River Valley Water Users Association, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Florida East Coast Railway Company,
Petitioner,
359 vs.
Mary C. Clark, as Administratrix of the Estate of Jacob W. Clark, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

F. Wm. Lensing, Receiver, The
First National Bank of Denton, Texas. On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court
363 vs. of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.
J. Fred Rayzor.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ex Parte: L. N. Frantz, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
364 to the United States Circuit Court
of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

O. R. Seagraves, On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court
365 vs. of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.
Henry M. Wallace, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

O. R. Seagraves,

Petitioner,

366 vs.

Henry M. Wallace, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Bankers Reserve Life Company,

Petitioner,

367 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Wingert,

Petitioner,

371 vs.

The President, Directors and Company of the Hagerstown Bank, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Miller Wingert,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

372 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

The President, Directors and Company of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

of the Hagerstown Bank, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lewis P. Wingert,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

373 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

The President, Directors and Company of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

of the Hagerstown Bank, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Martha A. Wingert,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

374 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

The President, Directors and Company of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

of the Hagerstown Bank, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Hagerstown Silk Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

375 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

The President, Directors and Company of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

of the Hagerstown Bank, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Antietam Knitting Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

376 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

The President, Directors and Company of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

of the Hagerstown Bank, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. S. Cvitkovich, Martin Boskivich,

Nikola Jandrilovich, et al., On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioners, to the United States Circuit Court

377 vs. of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Farmers Bank of Mt. Pulaski,
Illinois, et al., Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari
379 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
A. P. Bickenbach, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.
of Elmer E. Landis, Bankrupt.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana),
Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
383 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
Pennsylvania Railroad Company. of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward Kaminski,
Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
385 vs. to the Supreme Court of the
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & State of Minnesota.
Pacific Railroad Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chevrolet Motor Company, Petitioner,
336 vs.
Ray V. Cladding.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,
388 vs.
Howard C. Firth.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America on the relation of Knickerbocker Insurance Company of New York, Successor, etc., Petitioner,
389 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pacent Reproducer Corporation and
Pacent Electric Company, Inc.

Petitioners,

390 vs.

Western Electric Company, Inc.,
Electrical Research Products, Inc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, and it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles D. Chisholm, trading as
Chisholm Co. and Butler F. Greer,

Petitioners,

460 vs.

Benjamin Bernard Deitel.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Jones Store Co., Kansas City
Socialer Turnverein, et al.,

Petitioners,

391 vs.

Kansas City, Missouri.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edwin C. Kudy and Byron Langtry, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 392

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Miles Tatham and Nettie A. Tatham, his wife, Petitioners, vs. Sacramento Suburban Fruit Lands Company. 394

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John V. Kral, Petitioner, vs. Sacramento Suburban Fruit Lands Company. 395

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. A. Wagner,

Petitioner,

396 vs.

Sacramento Suburban Fruit Lands Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Anton Handler and Mate Handler,

Petitioners,

397 vs.

Sacramento Suburban Fruit Lands Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harry C. Klaffenbach and Carrie M. Klaffenbach,

Petitioners,

398 vs.

Sacramento Suburban Fruit Lands Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Howe P. Cochran, Petitioner, vs. James Couzens. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

399

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. J. Farley and Company, Petitioner, vs. Earl D. Stoll. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

401

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

"Mailliard & Schmiedell, et al.," and Mailliard & Schmiedell, a corporation, Petitioners, vs. Pacific Steamship Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

404

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American-Hawaiian Steamship Company,
a corporation,
Petitioner,
418 vs.
Pacific Steamship Company, Owner of
the Steamship "Admiral Fiske."

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Moran Towing & Transportation Company,
Petitioner,
406 vs.
J. W. Higman Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Samuel Malinow and Louis Malinow,
Petitioners,
407 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Stevens Hotel Company,

Petitioner,

408 vs.

Chicago Yacht Club and South Park Commissioners.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company, Petitioner,

409 vs.

John Bonura & Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Oscar Goldschlag,

Petitioner,

410 vs.

William F. Deegan, as Tenement House Commissioner of the City of New York, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ida S. Graustein,

Petitioner,

415 vs.

Westminister National Bank and Gardner Trust Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts, Worcester County.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of the State of Massachusetts, Worcester County, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John R. Smith,

Petitioner,

417 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Nancy C. Williams,

Petitioner,

419 vs.

The Order of United Commercial Travelers of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George S. Grueby and Frank A. Watts,

Petitioners,

420 vs.

Theodora M. Christopher, Adm'x., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

S. A. Grueby, Arthur L. Parker and John M. Fulham,

Petitioners,

421 vs.

Theodora M. Christopher, Adm'x., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mattie Willis, now Mattie Rogers,

Petitioner,

424 vs.

Lonie Scott, Lodie Willis and A. C. McMillan, Acting Superintendent of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Group No. 1 Oil Corporation,

Petitioner,

425 vs.

James M. Hans, Collector of Internal Revenue for the United States for the District of Texas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sarah Powers and Charlotte Powers,

Petitioners,

446 vs.

The New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Company and The City of Cleveland.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

... J. A. Petree,

Petitioner,

450 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mattie Wilmouth, as Administratrix of the Estate of John Y. Wilmouth, deceased, Petitioner, vs. Southern Railway Company.

444 On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Florindo Luccioni and Paul Courbis, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

447 On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The National City Bank of New York, Petitioner, vs. Petrogradsky Mejdunarodny Kommerchesky Bank, otherwise known as Banque Internationale de Commerce de Petrograd.

452 On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

City of Lake Worth, a Municipal Corporation,
Petitioner,
456 vs.
R. M. Grant & Company, Incorporated.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Duquesne Steel Foundry Company,
Petitioner,
457 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louis Goldstein,
Petitioner,
462 vs.
George H. Klages, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Ohio Galvanizing & Manufacturing Company,

Petitioner,

466 vs.

Southern Pacific Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John I. Sapinkopf,

Petitioner,

468 vs.

The Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Division, Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Division, Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. Stanley Copeland,

Petitioner,

476 vs.

James W. Higgins, Police Commissioner of Buffalo, New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Erie County.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Erie County, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

...atz,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

vs. to the United States Circuit Court

..., as President of the American of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

y of Composers, Authors and

hers and Jack Mills, Inc.

...n consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to ...ited States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the ...t of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that ...id petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

...korn,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

vs. to the United States Circuit Court

..., as President of the American of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

... of Composers, Authors and

...ers and Irving Berlin, Inc.

...n consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to ...ited States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the ...t of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that ...d petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

...orn,

...etitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

vs. to the United States Circuit Court

..., as President of the American of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

... of Composers, Authors and

...ers and Leo Feist, Inc.

...n consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to ...ed States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the ...t of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that ...d petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Iowa State Insurance Company of Keokuk, Iowa, Petitioner,

496 vs.

Grover Godwin and Dorothy G. Godwin.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the St. Louis Court of Appeals, State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the St. Louis Court of Appeals, State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. Frank Matheus, United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Petitioner,

451 vs.

The United States of America ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.

The suggestion of abatement herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, in support thereof, and by Mr. Benjamin M. Golder and Mr. Ruby R. Vale for the respondent, in opposition thereto.

Annie G. Phillips, et al., Executors, Petitioners,

455 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Duquesne Steel Foundry Co., Petitioner,
457 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Enameled Metals Co., Petitioner,
489 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

St. Louis National Baseball Club, Petitioner,
491 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Clara Brunton, Executrix, etc., Petitioner,
509 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

L. T. Waller and Mrs. L. T. Waller, Petitioners,
514 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Shelby J. Beene and Mrs. Shelby J. Beene, Petitioners,
515 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Francis Beidler II and George Engelking, as Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in error,
2 vs.
South Carolina Tax Commission.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. William D. O'Brien, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Tax Commission of the State of New York, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Memphis & Charleston Railway Company, Appellant,
8 vs.
C. L. Pace, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. J. A. Lauderdale, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Attorney General of the State of Mississippi, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Memphis & Charleston Railway Company, Appellant, 8 vs. C. L. Pace, et al.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. John B. Hyde, in that behalf, leave was granted appellant to file reply to brief of the Attorney General of the State of Mississippi, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
Educational Films Corporation of America, Appellant, 350 vs. Hamilton Ward, Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.	The joint motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger Hinds in that behalf.
Educational Films Corporation of America, Appellant, 350 vs. Hamilton Ward, Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roger Hinds for the appellant.
Edward T. Dunn, Appellant, 443 vs. State of Ohio.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rufus S. Day and Mr. W. E. Minshall for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Alfred Clum, Mr. Gilbert Bettman, and Mr. Frank R. Hubachek for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Mascot Oil Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
400 vs.
The United States.

The petition for writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore B. Benson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

United Profit Sharing Corporation,
Petitioner,
405 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sol M. Stroock, Mr. Edward F. Spitz, Mr. Charles C. Carlin, and Mr. M. Carter Hall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Joseph H. Shephard, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Roy A Fitcomb, Inc.,
Petitioner,
412 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore B. Benson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. L. A. Smith for the respondent.

W. Frank Matheus, United States Marshal, etc.,
Petitioner,
451 vs.
The United States of America, ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher and Mr. Harry S. Midgely for the petitioner, and by Mr. Benjamin M. Golder and Mr. Ruby R. Vale for the respondent.

Mulhens - Kropff, Inc.,
Petitioner,
458 vs.
Ferd. Muelhens, Inc.;
Ferd. Muelhens, Inc.,
Petitioner,
478 vs.
Mulhens - Kropff, Inc.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lucius E. Varney for the petitioner in No. 458; by Mr. Maxwell C. Katz, Mr. Otto C. Sommerich, and Mr. Edwin M. Borchard for the petitioner in No. 478 and respondent in No. 458; and by Mr. Lucius E. Varney and Mr. Manvel Whittemore for the respondent in No. 478.

Wood & Selick, Inc., and Joseph A. Riggi, individually, etc.,
Petitioners,
461 vs.
Henry Todd, Trustee, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll Blakely Low for the petitioners, and by Mr. Guy M. Page for the respondents.

Star Can Opener Company,
Petitioner,
473 vs.
Bunker-Clancy Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Ewing, Mr. Stephen J. Cox, Mr. John H. Miller, Mr. A. W. Boykin, and Mr. Francis C. Downey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Maurice H. Winger, Mr. Frank P. Barker, and Mr. Arthur C. Brown for the respondents.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1930 - CONTINUED

James E. Hamm, as Executor, etc., Petitioner,
474 vs.
Helen M. Marshall and Oscar J. Heig, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Winifred Sullivan and Mr. George C. Lay for the petitioner, and by Mr. Moses Cohen for the respondents.

Armin A. Schlesinger, Petitioner,
483 vs.
County of Milwaukee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles F. Fawsett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Eugene Wenbert for the respondent.

The Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
44 vs.
The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.;
The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission, et al., Appellants,
45 vs.
The Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Railway Company, et al.

Three hours allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. F. B. Moore for the Southwestern Lines; continued by Mr. Edward M. Ready for the United States and Interstate Commerce Commission; by Mr. Frank H. Towner for the Western Trunk Carriers, and concluded by Mr. Samuel M. Moore for the Southwestern Lines.

Frank L. Smith, et al., Appellants,
90 vs.
Illinois Bell Telephone Company.

Three hours allowed for the argument of this case. The argument was commenced by Mr. George I. Haight for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Benjamin F. Goldstein for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone.
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Perley J. Rose, It is ordered that Carrel F. Rhodes, Esquire, of Yazoo City, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hallock P. Long, It is ordered that Raymer H. Miller, Esquire, of Hannibal, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest H. Van Fossan, It is ordered that Thomas R. Dempsey, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Wattawa, It is ordered that Jack Davis, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Frank L. Smith, et al., Appellants, vs. Illinois Bell Telephone Company.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Benjamin F. Goldstein for the appellants, by Mr. William Dean Bangs for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Benjamin F. Goldstein for the appellants.
90	
Burns Poe, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Washington, vs. H. G. Seaborn.	This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for Poe, Collector, and by Mr. George Donworth for Seaborn.
15	

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry T. Newcomb, It is ordered that Joseph Resch, Esquire, of Albany, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter C. English, It is ordered that Herman P. Kassan, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Julius Gilmer Horner, Jr., It is ordered that Henry T. Dourance, Esquire, of Utica, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Lynch, It is ordered that Ephraim Banning, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Houston, It is ordered that Charles Hamilton Houston, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Houston, It is ordered that Milton Albert Kallis, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Fred O. Goodell, Collector of Internal Revenue,
106 vs.
I. B. Koch.

This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for Goodell, Collector, and by Mr. Clifton Matthews and Mr. Rhodes S. Baker for Koch.

Geo. C. Hopkins, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
94 vs.
C. W. Bacon.

This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry S. [illegible] and Mr. Palmer Hutcheson for the respondent.

Jacob O. Bender, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
86 vs.
William Pfaff.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Charles E. Dunbar, Jr., and Mr. Monte Lemann for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

Jacob O. Bender, Collector of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

86 vs.

William Pfaff.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Monte Lemann for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner. Leave was granted the respondent to file supplemental brief within three days.

District of Columbia,

Petitioner,

96 vs.

William M. Colts.

This case was argued by Mr. Robert E. Lynch for the petitioner, and by Mr. William B. O'Connell for the respondent.

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha Ry. Co., Plaintiff in error,

1 vs.

August E. Holmberg.

This case was argued by Mr. Wymer Dressler for the plaintiff in error, and by Mr. Hugh LaMaster for the defendant in error.

Francis Beidler II and George Engelking, as Executors, etc.,

Plaintiffs in error,

2 vs.

South Carolina Tax Commission.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. P. F. Henderson for the plaintiffs in error, and continued by Mr. J. Fraser Lyon for the defendant in error.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry H. Dinneen, It is ordered that Charles Carroll III, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Francis Beidler II and George Engelking, as Executors, etc., Plaintiffs in error,
2 vs.
South Carolina Tax Commission.

The reargument of this case was continued by Mr. J. Fraser Lyon for the defendant in error, and concluded by Mr. P. F. Henderson for the plaintiffs in error.

Powers-Kennedy Contracting Corporation, et al., Petitioners,
3 vs.
Concrete Mixing and Conveying Co.;
Concrete Mixing and Conveying Co., Petitioner,
4 vs.
R. C. Storrie & Co.

Three hours allowed for the oral argument of these cases. The reargument was commenced by Mr. John W. Morgan for the petitioner in No. 3; continued by Mr. Stephen J. Cox for the respondent in No. 3; by Mr. Lynn A. Williams for the petitioner in No. 4; and concluded by Mr. Charles E. Townsend for the respondent in No. 4. Leave was granted the respondent in No. 4 to file additional brief with leave to counsel for petitioner in No. 4 to file a reply thereto on or before October 28.

Indian Motocycle Company,

5 vs.

The United States of America.

The reargument of this case was commenced by Mr. Monte Appel for the Indian Motocycle Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James P. Burns, It is ordered that George R. Walsh, Esquire, of Elizabeth, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank F. Nesbit, It is ordered that Gabriel L. Hess, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James P. Burns, It is ordered that John M. Kerner, Esquire, of Elizabeth, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank F. Nesbit, It is ordered that Louis Phillips, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank F. Nesbit, It is ordered that Louis Nizer, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dozier A. DeVane, It is ordered that Curtis L. Sparkman, Esquire, of Tampa, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry E. Stauffer, It is ordered that Edward F. P. Brigham, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Ristine, It is ordered that Irwin William Rosenthal, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond J. Mawhinney, It is ordered that John Axon Mawhinney, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Small, It is ordered that Everett Brooks, Esquire, of Durham, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. F. Trabue, It is ordered that Junius C. Klein, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. F. Trabue, It is ordered that John P. Maswell, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. F. Trabue, It is ordered that John S. Milliken, Esquire, of Franklin, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. F. Trabue, It is ordered that Blakey Helm, Esquire, of Louisville, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

J. W. Alford,

Petitioner,

370 vs.

The United States of America.

O R D E R.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, January 5 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Aaron Prussian,

Petitioner,

448 vs.

The United States of America.

O R D E R.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be, and it is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, January 5 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Educational Films Corporation of America,

Appellant,

350 vs.

Hamilton Ward, Attorney General, etc.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted, and on consideration of the motion to advance the case, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, December 1 next.

Edward T. Dunn,

Appellant,

443 vs.

The State of Ohio.

Appeal From the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward T. Dunn,

Petitioner,

443 vs.

State of Ohio.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. Frank Mathues, United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania,
Petitioner,
451 vs.
The United States of America, ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. Frank Mathues, United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania,
Petitioner,
451 vs.
The United States of America, ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and on suggestion of the United States that the cause has abated, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgments of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals and of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, vacated; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania with directions to dismiss the proceeding as abated.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mascot Oil Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

400 vs.

The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Roy J. Titcomb, Inc.,

Petitioner,

412 vs.

The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

R. D. Spicer, F. G. Stewart and G. C. Hallawell,

Petitioners,

380 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. C. Stephens,

Petitioner,

381 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

B. M. Wotkyns,

Petitioner,

382 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United Profit Sharing Corporation,

Petitioner,

405 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1930 - CONTINUED

Mulhens & Kropff, Inc., Petitioner,
458 vs.
Ferd. Muelhens, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ferd. Muelhens, Inc., Petitioner,
478 vs.
Mulhens & Kropff, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wood & Selick, Inc. and Joseph A. Riggi, individually and as assignee, etc., Petitioners,
461 vs.
Henry Todd, Trustee, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

[illegible] Power Company,

Petitioner,

473 vs.

Bunker-Clancy Manufacturing Company, a corporation, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James E. Mans, as Executor under the last Will and Testament of John J. Mans, Deceased, Petitioner,

474 vs.

[illegible] M. Marshall and Oscar J. Heig, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Matthew M. Marshall.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Armin A. Schlesinger, Petitioner,

483 vs.

County of Milwaukee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order:

O R D E R.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, November 3, until Monday, November 24th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles M. Stange,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. John E. Haynes in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Holmes Manufacturing Company, as amicus curiae, herein.

— Original.
Ex parte: Doble Laboratories,
Petitioner,

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William P. Hall in behalf of counsel.

— Original.
Ex parte: D. B. Daugherty,
Petitioner,

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard L. Merrick for the petitioner.

Kook Wing,
Petitioner,
307 vs.
Philippine Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion to defer the consideration of the petition for certiorari in this case for a period of thirty days from this date, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, et al., Appellants, 517 vs. The United States of America, et al.	The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Rae Williams in behalf of counsel for the appellants.
The United States of America, Complainant, 14, Original. vs. The State of Utah.	The report of the Special Master was presented by Mr. Charles Warren.
—	
In Re Disbarment of H. A. Ledbetter.	The Report of the Committee of the Bar was presented.
Edward B. Weston, et al., Appellants, 30 vs. Beaver-Remmers-Graham Company,	The motion to dismiss or affirm was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lester A. Jaffe, Mr. J. Sprigg McMahon, and Mr. Murray Seasongood for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. Wellmore B. Turner and Mr. E. H. Turner for the appellant, in opposition thereto.
Gynther Storaasli, Appellant, 393 vs. The State of Minnesota.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Pierce Butler, Jr., and Mr. Charles Bunn for the appellant.
Magnolia State Building & Loan Association, Appellant, 442 vs. W. J. Miller, State Tax Collector.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Garner W. Green, Mr. Marcellus Green, Mr. R. H. Thompson, and Mr. Wm. H. Watkins for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Gordon Garland Lyell for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Guaranty Trust Company of New York, as Trustee, etc., Appellant,
465 vs.
New York & Queens County Railway Company, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. C. McCollom, Mr. Joseph S. Auerbach, Mr. Chas. E. Hotchkiss, Mr. Alfred T. Davison, and Mr. Martin A. Schenck for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. James H. McIntosh, Mr. James L. Quackenbush, and Mr. Charles F. Kingsley for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

Mock Wing, Petitioner,
307 vs.
Philippine Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. J. Rohde for the petitioner, and by Mr. Richard H. Wilmer for the respondent.

William C. Beckers, Petitioner,
411 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Craig Peacock and Mr. John M. Townsend for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Joseph H. Sheppard, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

St. Louis Architectural Iron Company, Petitioner,
475 vs.
New Amsterdam Casualty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John P. Leahy and Mr. James J. O'Donohoe for the petitioner.

The Coco-Cola Company,
Petitioner,
479 vs.
Carlisle Bottling Works.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas L. Mead, Jr., Mr. Harold Hirsch, and Mr. Frank Troutman for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. C. O'Rear for the respondent.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
484 vs.
Raladam Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Chas. H. Weston, Mr. William G. Davis, Mr. Robt. E. Healy, and Mr. Martin A. Morrison for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas G. Long for the respondent.

Eastern Massachusetts Street Railway Company,
Petitioner,
485 vs.
Transmarine Corporation and Pore River Coal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. Philip Wardner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Carroll Single and Mr. Albert T. Gould for the respondents.

Louis Mulesza, et al., Petitioners,
486 vs.
W. A. Blair, et al., etc.;
Louis Mulesza, et al., Petitioners,
487 vs.
American Car and Foundry Company, et al., etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Hamilton Lewis for the petitioners, and by Mr. James M. Sheean and Mr. Weymouth Kirkland for the respondent in No. 486, and Mr. Ephraim Banning for the respondent in No. 487.

Doble Laboratories, Petitioner,
488 vs.
Thomas Day Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick S. Lyon, Mr. Leonard S. Lyon, and Mr. William W. Dent for the petitioner, and by Mr. John H. Miller, Mr. George L. Wilkinson, and Mr. Langdon Moore for the respondent.

Enameled Metals Company, Petitioner,
489 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. Leo Rosenbaum, Mr. Samuel Kaufman, and Mr. George H. Roseman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. John Mac C. Hudson, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

St. Louis National Baseball Club, Petitioner,
491 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Leo C. Rucker, Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, James C. Jones, Jr., and Mr. Ralph T. Finley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. John Mac C. Hudson, Mr. Paul D. Miller, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Percy S. Crewe for the respondent.

Eda Luette and Mary Korhel Roberts, Petitioners,
492 vs.
Bank of Italy National Trust & Savings Association.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Westervelt and Mr. Williamson S. Summers for the petitioners, and by Mr. Elwyn Mudick for the respondent.

Sam Hill, otherwise known as Sam Stone, et al.,
Petitioners,
493 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Philip Hill and Mr. James A. O'Shea for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

McAvoy Company,
Petitioner,
494 vs.
Globe Indemnity Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Silas H. Strawn, Mr. John D. Black, and Mr. Harold A. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. George T. Buckingham for the respondent.

Charles B. Shedd,
Petitioner,
495 vs.
State Line Generating Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. B. Tinkham for the petitioner, and by Mr. Buell McKeever for the respondent.

Marshall Hall Milling Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
510 vs.
Mexican-American Fruit & Steamship Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll Single, Mr. J. M. Richardson Lyeth and Mr. Henry P. Dart, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. George H. Terriberry and Mr. Joseph M. Rault for the respondent.

Indian Motocycle Company,

5 vs.

The United States of America.

The reargument of this case was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the United States, and concluded by Mr. Monte Appel for the Indian Motocycle Company. Leave granted the Indian Motocycle Company to file memorandum today.

Paramount Famous Lasky Corporation, et al.,

Appellants,

83 vs.

The United States of America.

Leave granted appellants to file additional brief within four days on motion of Mr. John W. Davis. The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Cornelius W. Wickersham for the appellants, continued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellants.

The United States of America,

Appellant,

95 vs.

First National Pictures, Inc., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic P. Lee, It is ordered that James T. Donald, Esquire, of Baker, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Swindler, It is ordered that Walter F. Dodd, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William L. Newsom, It is ordered that Raymond A. Bartlett, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Foreman Trust & Savings Bank, as Trustee, et al., Appellants,
327 vs.
City of Chicago.

On consideration of the motion for the issuance of the mandate forthwith in this case,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America,
Appellant,
95 vs.
First National Pictures, Inc., et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellant; by Mr. Cornelius H. Dickerman for the appellees; by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellees; and concluded by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellant.

William J. Stratton, Secretary of State, etc.,
Appellant,
6 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co.

This case was reargued by Mr. Maynard Lacey Catron for the appellant and by Mr. Josiah Whitnel for the appellee.

Aluminum Castings Company,
Petitioner,
7 vs.
Carl F. Routzahn, individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue.

The reargument of this case was announced by Mr. John T. Scott for the petitioner and continued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 10 o'clock.

[illegible], [illegible] 22, 193[illegible]

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert C. Alston, It is ordered that Ellyne E. Strickland, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Paul Harnest, It is ordered that Edgar Mitchell, Esquire, of Parish, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Aluminum Castings Company,
Petitioner,
7 vs.
Carl F. Routzahn, individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue.

The reargument of this case was continued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. John T. Scott for the petitioner.

Memphis & Charleston Railway Company,
Appellant,
vs.
C. L. Pace, S. C. Stephens, et al.

This case was reargued by Mr. Jesse S. Hyde for the appellant, and by Mr. W. W. Magruder and Mr. B. H. Charles for the appellees.

Junius C. Klein,
Appellant,
vs.
Board of Tax Supervisors of Jefferson County, Kentucky.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Edmund F. Trabue for the appellant, and continued by Mr. W. J. Holifield for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

Enameled Metals Company,
Petitioner,
489 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the motion to defer consideration of the petition for certiorari in this case and for leave to file a supplemental brief for the petitioner,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, with leave to file a supplemental brief for petitioner on or before November 6th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Junius C. Klein,
Appellant,
11 vs.
Board of Tax Supervisors of
Jefferson County, Kentucky.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. M. B. Holifield for the appellee and concluded by Mr. Edmund F. Trabue for the appellant.

O'Gorman and Young, Inc.,
Appellant,
12 vs.
Hartford Fire Insurance Company of Hartford, Connecticut;
O'Gorman and Young, Inc.,
Appellant,
13 vs.
Phoenix Assurance Company, Ltd., of London.

These cases were reargued by Mr. Walter Gordon Merritt for the appellant, and by Mr. Ralph E. Lum for the appellees.

William A. Sherman, et al.,
14 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Karl D. Loos for Sherman, et al., and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the United States.

State of Florida, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
16 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
Brooks-Scanlon Corporation, et al.,
Appellants,
17 vs.
The United States of America, et al;
Wilson Lumber Company,
Appellant,
18 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. H. P. Adair for the appellants in No. 17.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer L. Bruce, It is ordered that R. D. Cox, Jr., Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Rossman, It is ordered that Robert F. Davis, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh M. Obear, It is ordered that Andrew D. Christian, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Joseph Wall, Charles Cramm, Andrew B. Van Nostrand, et al., Appellants,
25 vs.
Bankers Life Company of Des Moines, Iowa.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Frank W. Hamilton, as amicus curiae, in this cause. The motion for leave to present oral argument herein was denied.

Louisville & Nashville R. R. Co., et al., Appellants,
333 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred P. Thom for the appellants.

Charles H. Stange, Petitioner,
23 vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Frank A. Vanderlip and others, as amici curiae, in this cause.

State of Florida, et al., Appellants,
16 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
Brooks-Scanlon Corporation, et al., Appellants,
17 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
Wilson Lumber Company of Florida, Appellant,
18 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. H. P. Adair for the appellants in No. 17; by Mr. Fred H. Davis for the appellants in No. 16; by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission; by Mr. Robert C. Alston for the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company; and concluded by Mr. J. V. Norman for the appellant in No. 18.

Noah Crooks, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
24 vs.
Benjamin Harrelson, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Claude A. Branch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank S. Bright and Mr. S. L. Smartt for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court it adjourned until 10 o'clock

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul M. Segal, It is ordered that Abraham M. Katz, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul M. Segal, It is ordered that Charles Segal, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that John C. Lawyer, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Rozier Dulany, Jr., It is ordered that Alexander Macdonald, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that Bertha Ast, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dean G. Acheson, It is ordered that Lester Hood Woolsey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Hedley V. Cooke, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that J. Edward Lumbard, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank Clark, It is ordered that Cyrus French Wicker, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

In re: Disbarment of H. A. Ledbetter. O R D E R.

Upon consideration of the report and recommendation of the committee of the bar of this Court appointed April 22, 1930 in proceedings pursuant to a rule issued February 24, 1930 to H. A. Ledbetter to show cause why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court, It is ordered:

(1) That the said rule entered February 24, 1930 is hereby discharged and the said proceeding is hereby dismissed;

(2) That the Committee is requested to formulate and present such specific charge or charges, if any, as, upon consideration of the matters set forth in its said report, it deems to be appropriate for the further consideration of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.

Ex parte: D. B. Daugherty, Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and a rule to show cause is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, January 5th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.

Ex Parte: Doble Laboratories, Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Utah.

O R D E R.

The report of the Special Master is received and ordered to be filed. Exceptions by the parties, if any, shall be filed on or before January 26 next, and the case is assigned for hearing on such exceptions, if any, on Monday, February 24 next. Briefs in support of any exceptions are to be filed two weeks before the date fixed for hearing. Reply briefs, if any, are to be filed one week before such hearing.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, et al., Appellants,
335 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 12 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, et al.,
Appellants,
517 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 12 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward B. Weston, et al.,
Appellants,
30 vs.
Beaver-Remmers-Graham Company, et al.

It is ordered by the Court that further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm in this cause be postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gynther Storaasli,
Appellant,
393 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Magnolia State Building & Loan Association,
Appellant,
442 vs.
W. J. Miller, State Tax Collector.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Guaranty Trust Company of New York,
as Trustee, etc., Appellant,
465 vs.
New York & Queens County Railway Company, Bankers Trust Company of New York, as Trustee, etc., et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Queens.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Queens, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Federal Trade Commission,
Petitioner,
484 vs.
Raladam Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted, the briefs and argument to be limited to the question of the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William G. Beckers,
Petitioner,
411 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

St. Louis Architectural Iron Company,
a corporation,
Petitioner,
475 vs.
New Amsterdam Casualty Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Coca-Cola Company,
Petitioner,
479 vs.
Carlisle Bottling Works.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Eastern Massachusetts Street Railway
Company,
Petitioner,
485 vs.
Transmarine Corporation and Fore
River Coal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel, thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louis Kulesza, Ignatz Spiradek,
Frank Reynar, et al.,
Petitioners,
486 vs.
H. A. Blair and F. H. Rawson,
Receivers of the Chicago Railways
Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louis Kulesza, Ignatz Spiradek,
Frank Reynar, et al.,
Petitioners,
487 vs.
American Car and Foundry Company and
Addie Robinson, Administratrix of the
Estate of Elbert R. Robinson, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Doble Laboratories,
Petitioner,
488 vs.
Thomas Day Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

St. Louis National Baseball Club,
Petitioner,
491 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Eda Luette and Mary Korhel Roberts,
Petitioners,
492 vs.
Bank of Italy National Trust & Savings Association.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sam Mill, otherwise known as Sam Stone,
George Bolton, otherwise known as Harry Klein, et al., Petitioners,
493 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

McAvoy Company,

Petitioner,

494 vs.

Globe Indemnity Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles B. Shedd,

Petitioner,

495 vs.

State Line Generating Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Marshall Hall Milling Company, Arroz Milling Company, et al.,

Petitioners,

510 vs.

Mexican-American Fruit & Steamship Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mascot Oil Company, Inc., Petitioner,
400 vs.
The United States;
Roy & Titcomb, Inc., Petitioner,
412 vs.
The United States;
The United States, Petitioner,
416 vs.
Wyman, Partridge & Company;
D. B. Heiner, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
508 vs.
Erie Coal & Coke Company;
American Glue Company, Petitioner,
519 vs.
The United States of America;
Laura H. Jennings, as Executrix, etc., Petitioner,
529 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, individually, etc.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
33 vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The death of Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, and the qualification of Frank Collis Bowers as executor of the estate of the said Frank K. Bowers, having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that Frank Collis Bowers, as executor of the estate of Frank K. Bowers, be, and he is hereby, made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
160 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The death of Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, and the qualification of Frank Collis Bowers as executor of the estate of the said Frank K. Bowers, having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that Frank Collis Bowers, as executor of the estate of Frank K. Bowers, be, and he is hereby, made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. Frank Mathues, United States Marshal, etc.,
Petitioner,
451 vs.
The United States of America, ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.

On consideration of the motion to issue the mandate in this case forthwith,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
521 vs.
Edith Andrews Logan.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
522 vs.
Julia Andrews Bruce.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1929 - CONTINUED

The United States of America, 512 vs. Robert K. Malcolm.	The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. S. Y. Ivins for Malcolm.
Burns Poe, Collector, etc., 15 vs. H. G. Seaborn; Geo. C. Hopkins, Collector, etc., Petitioner, 84 vs. C. W. Bacon; Jacob O. Bender, Collector, etc., Petitioner, 86 vs. William Pfaff; Fred O. Goodell, Collector, etc., Petitioner, 106 vs. I. B. Koch.	The motion for leave to file the brief filed for Robert K. Malcolm in case No. 512 as a brief amicus curiae in these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. S. Y. Ivins in that behalf.
Russian Volunteer Fleet, Petitioner, 39 vs. The United States.	The motion to pass was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace S. Whitman for the petitioner.
—, Original. Ex parte: D. R. Walkinshaw, Petitioner,	The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. R. Walkinshaw, pro se.
Group No. 1, Oil Corporation, Petitioner, 425 vs. James W. Bass, Collector, etc.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. R. D. Cox, Jr., in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Texas as amicus curiae in support of the petition for rehearing, in this cause.

J. M. Robinson, et al., Appellants,
304 vs.
L. C. Holman, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Hibbler and Mr. Scipio A. Jones for the appellants.

S. S. Smith, Appellant,
vs.
W. B. Cahoon, Sheriff of Duval County, Florida.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellant.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
317 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Moore, Mr. Cyrus Crane, and Mr. Samuel W. Moore for the appellants.

Juan Posadas, Jr., as Collector, etc., Petitioner,
vs.
Miguel J. Ossorio.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Cattron Rigby, Mr. W. A. Graham, and Mr. E. A. Kreger for the petitioner.

Andrews Steel Company, Inc., Petitioner,
413 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert T. Tedrow and Mr. Walter W. McCaslin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Richard Musty, et al.,
Petitioners,
477 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. McMahon for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon Kiefer, Mr. F. Cadmus Sumrell, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Frank L. Young Company,
Petitioner,
490 vs.
McNeal Edwards Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John G. Palfrey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Asa P. French for the respondent.

Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Railway Company,
Petitioner,
497 vs.
International Milling Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles P. Stewart, Mr. Clint C. Hine, Mr. Harry M. Quigley, and Mr. Samuel W. Baxter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harold G. Simpson for the respondent.

Walton Tomplain, et al.,
Petitioners,
501 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh M. Wilkinson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. A. W. Henderson, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Walton Tomplain, et al., Petitioners,
502 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh M. Wilkinson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. A. W. Henderson, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

J. M. Beard, Petitioner,
503 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elwood H. Seal and Mr. Frank L. Muhleman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. E. T. Burke, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The United States, Petitioner,
504 vs.
Douglas Clyde Macintosh.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
505 vs.
Marie Averill Bland.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner.

Consolidated Machine Tool Corporation of America,

Petitioner,

507 vs.

The Collins Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold E. Stokesberry for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ephraim Banning for the respondent.

D. B. Heiner, Collector, etc.,

Petitioner,

508 vs.

Erie Coal & Coke Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Norman D. Keller for the petitioner.

Aetna Life Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

511 vs.

Robert C. Eaton, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Marshall Bullitt and Mr. Harry W. Reynolds for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. S. Mac Hanson, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Edward H. Horton for the respondent.

National Union Fire Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

516 vs.

Jacob Kaplan, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick D. Silber and Mr. Charles M. Kremer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel E. Hirsch for the respondents.

American Glue Company,
Petitioner,
519 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harris H. Gilman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. Norman D. Keller for the respondent.

Laura H. Jennings, as Executrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
529 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, individually, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert N. Miller and Mr. J. Robert Sherrod for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. Norman D. Keller for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, November 24, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward Taylor Fenwick, It is ordered that William D. Jones, Jr., Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh C. Bickford, It is ordered that Herman G. Lanten, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh C. Bickford, It is ordered that Craig L. Reddish, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank F. Nesbit, It is ordered that Charles E. Pledger, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Houston Merrill, It is ordered that Lloyd W. Greason, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Houston Merrill, It is ordered that Margaret Derby Connor, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fulton M. Brylawski, It is ordered that William T. Powers, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fulton M. Brylawski, It is ordered that Jacob H. Karp, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Ramsey, It is ordered that Philip A. Campbell, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Ramsey, It is ordered that James Patterson, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dale D. Drain, It is ordered that George E. Worthington, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Austin F. Canfield, It is ordered that Francis Cabell Brown, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard S. Doyle, It is ordered that John Enrietto, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Lawrence A. Baker, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake, It is ordered that George T. Evans, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, It is ordered that Stephen F. Colladay, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, It is ordered that Joseph C. McCarraghy, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward Taylor Fenwick, It is ordered that Charles Rogers Fenwick, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that J. Cleo Thompson, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that Bayard B. Shields, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Alfred A. Gardner, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Joseph F. Keany, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that Richard E. Stillman, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Tepper, It is ordered that Bernard Austin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Burns Poe, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Washington,
15 vs.
H. C. Seaborn.

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate and the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Fred O. Goodell, Collector of Internal Revenue,
106 vs.
I. B. Koch.

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate and the transcript of record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Geo. C. Hopkins, Collector of
Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
84 vs.
C. W. Bacon.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Jacob O. Bender, Collector of
Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
86 vs.
William Pfaff.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Aluminum Castings Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

7 vs, United States Circuit Court of

Carl F. Routzahn, Individually and as Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

Collector of Internal Revenue.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Sutherland in which Mr. Justice Roberts concurs.

Separate opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Butler.

The Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western

Railway Company, The Fort Worth and

Denver City Railway Company, et al., Appeal from the District Court

Appellants, of the United States for the

44 vs. Western District of Missouri.

The United States of America, The

Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America and
The Interstate Commerce Commission,

Appellants,

45 vs.

The Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western Railway Company, The Fort Worth and Denver City Railway Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order for stay of the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission entered by the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Noah Crooks, Collector of
Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

24 vs.

Benjamin Harrelson, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

District of Columbia, Petitioner, vs. William H. Colts. — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

96

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Paramount Famous Lasky Corporation, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Distributing Corporation, First National Pictures, Inc., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

83

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. First National Pictures, Inc., et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

95

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Junius C. Klein, Appellant, vs. Board of Tax Supervisors of Jefferson County, Kentucky. — Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

11

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

William A. Sherman, M. F. Cochrane, and J. B. Sanford, Constituting the Board of State Harbor Commissioners of the State of California, etc., vs. The United States of America. On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

14

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate and the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby remanded to the said District Court of the United States for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Francis Beidler, II, and George Engelking, as Executors of the Last will and Testament of Francis Beidler, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. South Carolina Tax Commission. In error to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

2

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, so far as it relates to the taxation of the transfer of the debts in question, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur on authority.

William J. Stratton, Secretary of State of the State of Illinois, Appellant, vs. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company. 6

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals with directions to dismiss the appeal to that court for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Roberts Sash and Door Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 97

Order granting petition for rehearing and allowing certiorari.

On consideration of the petition for rehearing filed herein, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition for rehearing be, and the same is hereby, granted. The order heretofore entered on October 13, 1930, denying the petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims herein is vacated, and it is ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari in this case be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Group No. 1 Oil Corporation,
Petitioner,
425 vs.
James W. Bass, Collector of Internal Revenue for the United States for the First District of Texas.

Order granting petition for rehearing and allowing certiorari.

On consideration of the petition for rehearing filed herein, and in view of the interest of the State of Texas, as stated by it as amicus curiae in support of the petition for rehearing, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, granted. The order heretofore entered on October 20, 1930, denying the petition for writ of certiorari herein is vacated, and it is ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Duquesne Steel Foundry Company,
Petitioner,
457 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order granting petition for rehearing and allowing certiorari.

On consideration of the petition for rehearing filed herein, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said petition for rehearing be, and the same is hereby, granted. The order heretofore entered on October 20, 1930, denying the petition for writ of certiorari herein is vacated, and it is ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in this cause be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

In re Albert T. Patrick. O R D E R.

The report of the committee of the bar of this Court, appointed by order of this Court April 22, 1930, to consider the charges heretofore filed against Albert T. Patrick, is received and filed.

On consideration of the said report of the committee, recommending that Albert T. Patrick be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court, and of the exceptions of the said Patrick thereto, and on consideration of his exhibits and brief in support of the exceptions, filed by leave of this Court,

It is ordered that the said Albert T. Patrick be, and he is hereby, disbarred, and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice in this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original. On consideration of the motion for
Ex Parte: R. D. Walkinshaw, Petitioner, leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, On consideration of the motion to ad-
512 vs. vance this cause, It is now here ordered
Robert K. Malcolm. by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, January 12 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. M. Robinson, et al.,

Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

304 vs. State of Arkansas.

L. C. Holman, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. M. Robinson, et al.,

Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

304 vs. State of Arkansas.

L. C. Holman, et al.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

E. S. Smith,

Appellant,

449 vs.

W. B. Cahoon, Sheriff of Duval County, Florida.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, et al., Appellants,

517 vs.

The United States of America, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Enameled Metals Company,
Petitioner,
489 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Richard Husty and Charles Laurel,
Petitioners,
477 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank L. Young Company,
Petitioner,
490 vs.
McNeal-Edwards Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States,
Petitioner,
504 vs.
Douglas Clyde MacIntosh.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
505 vs.
Marie Averil Bland.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania,
Petitioner,
508 vs.
Erie Coal & Coke Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Glue Company, Petitioner,
519 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Laura H. Jennings, as Executrix of the Last Will and Testament of Frederic B. Jennings, deceased, Petitioner,
529 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, Individually and as United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Juan Posados, Jr., as Collector of Internal Revenue of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
356 vs.
Miguel J. Ossorio.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Andrews Steel Company, Inc.,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

413 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Railway Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court

497 vs. of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

International Milling Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Walton Tomplain, Nolan Tomplain, Bartoul Cheramie, et al.,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court

501 vs. of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Walton Tomplain, Alexander Mitchell
and Octave Calle,
Petitioners,
502 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. M. Beard,
Petitioner,
503 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Concolidated Machine Tool Corporation
of America,
Petitioner,
507 vs.
The Collins Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Aetna Life Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

511 vs.

Robert O. Eaton, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

National Union Fire Insurance Company, a corporation,

Petitioner,

516 vs.

Jacob Kaplan and Louis Kaplan, Co-Partners, Trading as Kaplan Brothers.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mascot Oil Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
400 vs.
The United States;
Roy & Titcomb, Inc.,
Petitioner,
412 vs.
The United States;
The United States,
Petitioner,
416 vs.
Wyman, Partridge & Company;
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,
508 vs.
Erie Coal & Coke Company;
American Glue Company, Petitioner,
519 vs.
The United States of America;
Laura H. Jennings, as Executrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
529 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, individually, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, it is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that these cases, together with No. 97, Roberts Sash & Door Company vs. The United States, be advanced and assigned for argument immediately after case No. 463 in the following order: Nos. 529, 519, 416, 508, 97, 400 and 412.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States,
Complainant,
—, Original. vs.
The State of Oregon.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the complainant.

The State of Arizona, Complainant,
19 Original. vs.
The State of California, et al.

On consideration of the motion to extend the return day to January 12, 1931, in this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

General Motors Acceptance Corporation,
35 vs.
The United States of America.

The memorandum suggesting the dismissal of the certificate herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the United States.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
521 vs.
Edith Andrews Logan;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
522 vs.
Julia Andrews Bruce;
Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
535 vs.
Northern Trust Company, Executor, etc.

Leave was granted to file memorandum on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, in that behalf.

The Apollo Steel Company, Petitioner,
526 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,
It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pantages Theatre Company, a Corporation, Petitioner,
530 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
535 vs.
Northern Trust Company, Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Ellen L. Van Schaick.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Adele Kahle, Petitioner,
540 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cyrus H. McCormick, et al.,
Executors, Petitioners,
542 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Nash-Breyer Motor Company, Formerly
Troy Motor Sales Company,
Petitioner,
549 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louis H. Ensten, et al.,
Petitioners,
46 vs.
Simon Ascher & Company, Inc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Benjamin T. Roodhouse, Mr. James A. Brown, and Mr. Charles Neave, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Excelsior Steel Furnace Company, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Kock Wing,
Petitioner,
307 vs.
Philippine Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion to defer the consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause until December 12th,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, with leave to respondent to file brief on or before December 12th.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Anna Uravic, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
32 vs.
F. Jarka Company, Inc., et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Fontaine C. Bradley, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd., as amicus curiae, in this cause.

R. E. Graham and E. E. Foster, co-partners, etc., Petitioners,
36 vs.
Rex B. Goodcell, Former Collector, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Fontaine C. Bradley, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of American Refractories Company and others as amici curiae, in this cause.

General Motors Acceptance Corporation,
35 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to bring up the entire record and cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fontaine C. Bradley for the General Motors Acceptance Corporation.

—, Original.
Ex Parte: E. Harper and C. E. Crigger, Petitioners,

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry J. Balzer for the petitioners.

R. E. Graham and E. E. Foster, co-partners, etc., Petitioners,
36 vs.
Rex B. Goodcell, Former Collector, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Karl K. Gartner, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Illinois Kaolin Company, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Hans Nelson, Petitioner,
349 vs.
Puget Sound Navigation Company.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the petitioner for leave to file a petition for rehearing out of time and within ten days from this date,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hon. Ralph S. Latshaw, as Judge of the Circuit Court of Jackson County, etc., Appellant,
467 vs.
State of Missouri ex rel. Kansas City Public Service Company.

The motion of Kansas City for leave to intervene and to be made a party appellant herein, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. H. Brinkman in that behalf, with leave to file affidavits in support of the motion by Friday next.

—, Original.
Ex Parte: William Wallace Blaine, Petitioner,

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of habeas corpus herein, and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by William Wallace Blaine, pro se.

Ex Parte: Morton S. Hawkins, Petitioner,
539

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lee Bond for the petitioner.

Ayoup S. Hatem, Petitioner,
541 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles L. Abernethy for the petitioner.

Douglass Harrison, Petitioner,
556 vs.
L. E. Myers Construction Company, et al.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh Carney for the petitioner.

Georgia M. Spruill, Petitioner,
559 vs.
William D. Buck.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Georgia M. Spruill pro se.

Hon. Ralph S. Latshaw, as Judge of the Circuit Court of Jackson County, etc., Appellant,
467 vs.
State of Missouri ex rel. Kansas City Public Service Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marcy K. Brown, Jr., for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Robert W. Otto, Mr. Richard J. Higgins, Mr. Henry N. Ess, and Mr. Powell C. Groner for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Appellant,
470 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California, et al.;
Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company, Appellant,
471 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California, et al., etc.;
Southern Pacific Company and Southern Pacific Railroad Company, Appellants,
472 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Karr, Mr. C. W. Durbrow, Mr. Robert Brennan, Mr. E. W. Camp and Mr. A. S. Halsted for the appellants.

John M. Brant Company, Petitioner,
454 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Earle W. Wallick and Mr. David J. Shorb for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

George A. Hormel & Company, Petitioner,
459 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. L. Hamby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. George H. Foster, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Dow W. Walker, et al., Petitioners,
498 vs.
Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James J. Crossley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. Thos. E. Rhodes, Mr. Paul D. Miller, and Mr. A. W. Henderson for the respondent.

Clara Brunton, as Executrix, etc., Petitioner,
509 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Minor Moore for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. H. Conner, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. J. K. Polk for the respondent.

L. T. Waller, et al., Petitioners,
514 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
Shelby J. Beene, et al., Petitioners,
515 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred R. Angevine and Mr. John H. Tucker, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John G. Remey, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Commercial Bank of Scotland,
Petitioner,
518 vs.
McMillan, Hazen & Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James J. Lynch and Mr. James B. Sizer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Vaughn Miller for the respondents.

Lewis-Simas-Jones Company,
Petitioner,
520 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, State of California, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest Clewe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henley C. Booth and Mr. James M. Lyons for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
521 vs.
Edith Andrews Logan;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
522 vs.
Julia Andrews Bruce.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. Randolph C. Shaw, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Allin H. Pierce for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. S. Doyle for the respondents.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
523 vs.
J. Rogers Flannery & Company;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
524 vs.
The Flannery Bolt Company;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
525 vs.
Vanadium Metals Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Kenneth N. Parkinson and Mr. David A. Pine for the respondents.

The Apollo Steel Company, Petitioner,
526 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul Armitage for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John Mac C. Hudson, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Camilli Weidenfeld, Petitioner,
528 vs.
Pacific Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Daniels for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur H. Van Brunt, Mr. Welles V. Moot, and Mr. H. Z. M. Rodgers for the respondent.

Pantages Theatre Company, Petitioner,
530 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John Henry McEvers, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian, etc., Petitioner,
531 vs.
International Insurance Company of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan Ottinger and Mr. Charles J. Schuck for the petitioner, and by Mr. David Rumsey, Mr. Henry Newton Arnold, and Mr. Louis A. Johnson for the respondent.

Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian, etc., Petitioner,
532 vs.
International Insurance Company of New York, et al.;
Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian, etc., Petitioner,
533 vs.
International Insurance Company of New York, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan Ottinger and Mr. Charles J. Schuck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Emory R. Buckner and Mr. Louis A. Johnson for the respondents.

American Surety Company of New York, Petitioner,
534 vs.
Cove Irrigation District.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sterling M. Wood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Horace S. Davis for the respondent.

Cyrus H. McCormick, et al., executors, etc., Petitioners,
542 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert N. Miller, Mr. Horace Kent Tenney and Mr. Roger Sherman for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, et al., Appellants,
464 vs.
W. G. Maxcy, as Receiver of the Washburn Water Works Company, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Suel D. Arnold for the appellants, and by Mr. Robert M. Rieser for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence B. Des Jardines, It is ordered that John E. Walker, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chapin B. Bauman, It is ordered that John R. Parkinson, Esquire, of Daytona Beach, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Archer, It is ordered that William L. Marbury, Jr., Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Paul Jones, It is ordered that John E. Lentz, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. Carmalt, It is ordered that Herman Lewis Bennett, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that John S. Underwood, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Wyoming, Complainant,
20 Original. vs.
The State of Colorado.

On consideration of the motion and stipulation to postpone the return day for filing answer of the defendant to March 2, 1931,
It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Go-Bart Importing Co., Philip D. Gowen, et al., Petitioners,
111 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Edward F. Colladay for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.

Thomas M. Wampler, Appellant,
402 vs.
E. Lee Lecompte, State Game Warden, etc., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. T. Morris Wampler for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The United States of America, et al. Appellants,
10 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific R. R. Co.

This case was reargued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellants, and by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jerry A. Mathews, It is ordered that Sanfjord Brogdyne Teu II, Esquire, Godwin, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ira L. Ewers, It is ordered that Victor H. Pinckney, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conrad H. Syme, It is ordered that Albert Viault, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Lektophone Corporation,
Petitioner,
19 vs.
The Rola Company.

This case was argued by Mr. William H. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the respondent.

Miller Brothers Co.,

Petitioner,

68 vs.

Lektophone Corporation.

This case was argued by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., and Mr. Theodore S. Kenyon for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Davis for the respondent.

Proclamation being made, the

MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1930.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin P. DeWitt, It is ordered that Siegfried F. Hartman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Conrad H. Syme, It is ordered that William B. Wolf, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha Railway Company, Plaintiff in Error, vs. August E. Holmberg. — In error to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

1

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Frank L. Smith, Cicero J. Lindly, Hal W. Trovillion, et al., etc., et al., Appellants, vs. Illinois Bell Telephone Company. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

90

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, set aside, with costs in this Court to Appellants; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court, specially constituted as provided by the statute, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court, the restraining order entered in the suit to be continued pending further action of the District Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

The United States of America, Complainant,
—, Original. vs.
The State of Oregon.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a bill of complaint in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, February 24, 1931.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ex parte:
E. Harper and C. E. Crigger,
23, Original. Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that cause be shown by Honorable John E. Martineau, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas, in printed form, returnable Monday, January 5, 1931, why a writ of mandamus should not issue out of this Court requiring him to set aside the order of September 19, 1930, overruling plaintiffs' motion to strike from the files of said District Court the transcript of record in the case of E. Harper and C. E. Crigger vs. Drainage District No. 17 of Mississippi County, Arkansas, et al., and to strike the transcript in said cause from the files of said court, or to remand said cause to the Chancery Court of Mississippi County, State of Arkansas.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.
Ex parte: William Wallace Blaine, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motions for leave to file a petition for writ of habeas corpus herein and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis;

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

General Motors Acceptance Corporation,
35 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to bring up the entire record and cause in this case,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

General Motors Acceptance Corporation,
35 vs.
The United States of America.

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the certificate and transcript of record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and on the confession of error filed by the United States of America.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska with instruction to dismiss the libel.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ayoup S. Hatem,
Petitioner,
541 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ayoup S. Hatem,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

541

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Douglass Harrison,
Petitioner,
vs.
L. E. Myers Construction Company and Southwestern Gas & Electric Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

556

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Douglass Harrison,
Petitioner,
vs.
L. E. Myers Construction Company and Southwestern Gas & Electric Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

556

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Georgia M. Spruill,
Petitioner,
559 vs.
William D. Buck.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Georgia M. Spruill,
Petitioner,
559 vs.
William D. Buck.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hon. Ralph S. Latshaw, as Judge of the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri, and Division No. 8, thereof,
Appellant,
467 vs.
State of Missouri ex rel. Kansas City Public Service Company.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hon. Ralph S. Latshaw, as Judge of the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri, and Division No. 8, thereof,

Appellant,

467 vs.

State of Missouri ex rel. Kansas City Public Service Company.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hon. Ralph S. Latshaw, as Judge of the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri, and Division No. 8, thereof,

Appellant,

467 vs.

State of Missouri ex rel. Kansas City Public Service Company.

O R D E R.

The appeal in this cause having been dismissed this day for the want of jurisdiction, the Court does not pass upon the motion of the City of Kansas City, Missouri, for leave to intervene and to be made a party appellant in this case.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Appellant,

470 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, et al., etc.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company, Appellant,

471 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, et al., etc.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Pacific Company, et al.,
Appellants,
472 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California, et al., etc.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Richard Husty and Charles Laurel,
Petitioners,
477 vs.
The United States of America.

ORDER.

It is now here ordered by the Court that this case be, and it is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, January 19, 1931.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lewis-Simas-Jones Company,
Petitioner,
520 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, State of California, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Davis Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
521 vs.
Edith Andrews Logan.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

522 vs.

Julia Andrews Bruce.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John M. Brant Company,

Petitioner,

454 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George A. Hormel & Company,

Petitioner,

459 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dow V. Walker and August Wemme,

Petitioners,

498 vs.

Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian of the United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Clara Brunton, as Executrix of the Last will and testament of and estate of Robert Brunton, deceased,

Petitioner,

509 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

L. T. Waller and Mrs. L. T. Waller,

Petitioners,

514 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Shelby J. Beene and Mrs. Shelby J. Beene,

Petitioners,

515 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commercial Bank of Scotland,

Petitioner,

518 vs.

McMillan, Hazen & Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

523 vs.

J. Rogers Flannery & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. The Flannery Bolt Company. 524

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Vanadium Metals Company. 525

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Camille Weidenfeld, Petitioner, vs. Pacific Steamship Company. 528

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pantages Theatre Company,

Petitioner,

530 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian of the United States, suing as such,

Petitioner,

531 vs.

International Insurance Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian of the United States, suing as such,

Petitioner,

532 vs.

International Insurance Company of New York, Crum & Forster, Inc., Sumner Ballard, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian of the United States, suing as such, Petitioner,
533 vs.
International Insurance Company of New York, Crum & Forster, Inc., Sumner Ballard, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Surety Company of New York, Petitioner,
534 vs.
Cove Irrigation District.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Apollo Steel Company, Petitioner,
526 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Various Items of Personal Property, etc., et al., Petitioners,
114 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
523 vs.
J. Rogers Flannery & Company.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
524 vs.
The Flannery Bolt Company.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
525 vs.
Vanadium Metals Company.

The resignation of Robert H. Lucas and the appointment of David Burnet as Commissioner of Internal Revenue having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that David Burnet, present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, be made the party petitioner in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Adele Kahle,
Petitioner,
540 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Leave was granted the respondent to file brief within one week on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent, in that behalf.

Wright & Taylor, Inc.,
Petitioner,
565 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Collector, etc.

The joint motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in that behalf.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
31. vs.
Sanford & Brooks Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Charles D. Hamel, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Crossman & Sielcken, in Liquidation, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

No. — The petition of the American Bar Association for modification of Equity Rule No. 75 was presented to the Court by Mr. John W. Davis.

Marshall L. Mott,
Petitioner,
78 vs,
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. John W. Davis, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of John W. Davis, Hugh H. O'Bear, Carroll G. Walter, Rayburn L. Foster, and Almond D. Cochran, as amici curiae, in this cause.

Noah Crooks, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
24 vs.
Benjamin Harrelson, et al.

On consideration of the motion to have the mandate issued forthwith in this cause,
It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original. Ex Parte: Johnson Oil Refining Company, Petitioner.	The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long for the petitioner.
F. E. Thomas, Appellant, 499 vs. State of Georgia.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benj. E. Pierce for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. George M. Napier and Mr. T. R. Gress for the appellee in opposition thereto.
Ed Petty, Appellant, 500 vs. State of Georgia.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benj. E. Pierce for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. George M. Napier and Mr. T. R. Gress for the appellee in opposition thereto.
George W. Baker, Appellant, 506 vs. The State of New Mexico.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elmer L. Brock for the appellant.
State of Alabama, et al., Appellants, 513 vs. The United States of America, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar Watkins, Mr. Charlie C. McCall, Mr. Mac Asbill, and Mr. Hugh White for the appellants.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

535 vs.

Northern Trust Company, Executor, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Prey Savoy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Theodore Schmidt and Mr. Frederic Ullmann for the respondent.

College Silk Throwing Company,

Petitioner,

538 vs.

American Credit Indemnity Company of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter J. Rosston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic M. P. Pearse for the respondent.

Adele Kahle,

Petitioner,

540 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Brennan, Jr., Mr. John F. McCarron, and Mr. Edward W. Foristel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. E. Louis Monarch, Mr. A. G. Divet, Mr. C. M. Charest and Mr. Prew Savoy for the respondent.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company,

Petitioner,

543 vs.

Noah Moquin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry S. Mitchell and Mr. John E. Palmer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Tom Davis and Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondent.

Dollie F. Leitch and Olive Leitch,
Petitioners,
551 vs.
City of Chicago, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Olive A. Leitch pro se, and by Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson and Mr. Albert H. Veeder for the respondents.

Wright & Taylor, Inc.,
Petitioner,
565 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Kentucky.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald V. Hunter and Mr. Robert H. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John Mac C. Hudson for the respondent.

Educational Films Corporation of America,
Appellant,
350 vs.
Hamilton Ward, Attorney General of the State of New York, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Benjamin P. DeWitt for the appellant, continued by Mr. Wendell P. Brown for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Roger Hinds for the appellant.

Harvey Cox,
Appellant,
20 vs.
The People of the State of Colorado, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. M. W. Spaulding for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
21 vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts. Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tilman B. Parks, It is ordered that Ned A. Stewart, Esquire, of Lewisville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis F. Glenn, It is ordered that Henry L. Balaban, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. S. Oppenheim, It is ordered that Henry W. Price, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard L. Bump, It is ordered that Francis C. Ryan, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that W. Leo Austin, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
21 vs.
The Equitable Trust Company of New York, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent.

Marshall L. Mott,
Petitioner,
78 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles B. Rogers for the petitioner. The Court declined to hear further argument.

L. M. Willcuts, as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
22 vs.
Charles W. Bunn.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Bunn for the respondent.

Charles H. Stange,
Petitioner,
23 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. W. Spalding for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hodges, It is ordered that Herbert Boutell Barlow, Esquire, of Providence, Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Edward Paxson, It is ordered that Gerald J. Dean, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Edward Paxson, It is ordered that Harold J. Ryan, Esquire, of Reading, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that Stanley Folz, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that Jerome J. Rothschild, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that Milton A. Ramsler, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert T. Scott, It is ordered that W. E. Lea, Esquire, of Orange, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles H. Stange,
Petitioner,
23 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. W. W. Spalding for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
231 vs.
Chicago Railway Equipment Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry W. Price for the respondent.

Annette Aiken, Administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
69 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

This case was argued by Mr. W. Leo Austin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

W. P. Brown & Sons Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
115 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

This case was argued by Mr. W. W. Spalding for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent. Leave was granted petitioner to file reply brief within five days on motion of Mr. W. W. Spalding for the petitioner.

Broad River Power Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
528, October Term, 1929. vs.
State of South Carolina, ex rel.
John M. Daniel, Attorney General.

The reargument of this case was commenced by Mr. George M. LePine for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Melville Church, It is ordered that Harry M. Baetjer, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Irvin G. Bieser, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Harry Covington, It is ordered that Henry Herbert Balch, Esquire, of Easton, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy G. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Andrew U. Thomas, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that A. Y. Milam, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that Robert R. Milam, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. McClennen, It is ordered that Clifton F. Weidlich, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Broad River Power Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
528, October Term, 1929. vs.
State of South Carolina ex rel.
John M. Daniel, Attorney General.

The reargument of this case was continued by Mr. George M. LePine for the petitioners, by Mr. Irvine F. Belser for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. George M. LePine for the petitioner.

Joseph Wall, et al.,
Appellants,
25 vs.
Bankers Life Company of Des Moines, Iowa.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Louis H. Salinger for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Mead-Morrison Mfg. Co.,
Appellant,
28 vs.
Russell B. Marchant, as Trustee, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Kenneth M. Spence for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ross A. Collins, It is ordered that James Whitehurst, Esquire, of Brooksville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ross A. Collins, It is ordered that John Whitehurst, Esquire, of Brooksville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mead-Morrison Mfg. Company,
Appellant,
28 vs.
Russell B. Marchant, as Trustee, etc.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Kenneth M. Spence for the appellee.

Clinton R. White 29 vs. George E. Q. Johnson and H. D. Hayes.	This case was argued by Mr. Henry K. Urion for White, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for Johnson, et al.
American Bond & Mortgage Company and Trianon, Inc. 210 vs. The United States of America.	This case was argued by Mr. George W. Swain for American Bond and Mortgage Company, et al., and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for The United States.
Edward B. Weston, et al., etc., Appellants, 30 vs. Beaver-Remmers-Graham Co., et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Guy H. Wells for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 31 vs. Sanford & Brooks Company.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock

MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. Hoover, It is ordered that Herbert V. Lacey, Esquire, of Cheyenne, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Donald P. Shinn, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. August V. Rieke, It is ordered that Maurice H. Rieke, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that John Rynerson, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Eastham, It is ordered that Samuel Kniess Philips, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. August V. Rieke, It is ordered that Walter N. Carroll, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George C. Butte, It is ordered that Robert Lee Bobbitt, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Thomas M. Wampler,

Appellant,

402 vs.

E. Lee LeCompte, State Game Warden of Maryland, and Frederick S. Barber, District Deputy, etc.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Lektophone Corporation, Petitioner, vs. The Rola Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

19

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice took no part in the decision of this case.

Miller Brothers Company, Petitioner, vs. Lektophone Corporation. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

68

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice took no part in the decision of this case.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

—, Original.

Ex parte: Johnson Oil Refining Company, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Various Items of Personal Property, etc., et al., Petitioners,

114 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument immediately following case No. 74, The United States of America vs. LeFranca.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

F. E. Thomas, Appellant,

499 vs.

The State of Georgia.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

F. E. Thomas,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

499 vs. State of Georgia.

The State of Georgia.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ed Petty,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

500 vs. State of Georgia.

The State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ed Petty,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

500 vs. State of Georgia.

The State of Georgia.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George W. Baker,

Appellant,

506 vs.

The State of New Mexico.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George W. Baker,

Appellant,

506 vs.

The State of New Mexico.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State of Alabama and Alabama Public Service Commission,

Appellants,

513 vs.

The United States of America, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harvey Cox,

Appellant,

vs.

The People of the State of Colorado, The Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado, et al., etc.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph Wall, Charles Gramm, Andrew B. Van Nostrand, et al.,

Appellants,

vs.

Bankers Life Company of Des Moines, Iowa, a Corporation.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mead-Morrison Manufacturing Company,

Appellant,

vs.

Russell B. Marchant, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Bear Tractors, Incorporated.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward B. Weston and the Dayton Savings & Trust Company, as Trustee of the Estate of John Henry Vaile, Deceased, Appellants, vs. Beaver-Remmers-Graham Company, Walter F. Phelps, Receiver of the Beaver-Remmers-Graham Company, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

30

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and on motion of appellees to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered that the motion to dismiss the appeal herein be, and the same is hereby, granted.

And it is further ordered that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Noah Moquin.

543

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota is granted, the argument and briefs to be limited to the question arising from the failure of the state court to grant a new trial in a case under the Federal Employers' Liability Act where the verdict was obtained by appeals to passion and prejudice.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wright & Taylor, Inc.,
Petitioner,
565 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Kentucky.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wright & Taylor, Inc.,
Petitioner,
565 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Kentucky.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument immediately following case No. 529, Laura H. Jennings, as Executrix, etc. vs. Charles W. Anderson, Individually and as United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cyrus H. McCormick, et al., Executors of the Last Will and Testament of Nettie Fowler McCormick, Deceased,
Petitioners,
542 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
535 vs.
Northern Trust Company, Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Ellen L. Van Schaick.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

College Silk Throwing Company, Petitioner,
538 vs.
American Credit Indemnity Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dollie F. Leitch and Olive Leitch, Petitioners,
551 vs.
City of Chicago, et al. and State of Illinois, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order:

O R D E R.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, December 15th until Monday, January 5, 1931.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

U. G. Denman, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
60 vs.
W. L. Slayton.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. John E. Walker, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Fred H. Davis and Robert R. Reed, as amici curiae, in this cause.

Kermode F. Gill, Surviving partner, etc., Petitioner,
544 vs.
Benjamin Franklin Realty & Holding Company, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. George G. Chandler, in that behalf, leave was granted petitioner to file reply brief by Friday next, in this cause.

R. E. Graham and E. E. Foster, co-partners, etc., Petitioners,
36 vs.
Rex B. Goodcell, Former Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Albert S. Lisenby, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Tobacco Products Corporation of New York, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

American Fruit Growers, Inc., Petitioner,
48 vs.
Brogdex Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Robert Lee Bobbitt, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the States of Alabama, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas, as amici curiae, in this cause; and the motion on behalf of said States for leave to participate in the oral argument as amici curiae, by Mr. Robert Lee Bobbitt, in that behalf.

Nathaniel P. Pratt and George L. Bratt, Petitioners, vs. Charles J. Weeks; Nathaniel P. Pratt and George L. Pratt, Petitioners, vs. Charles J. Weeks.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar Watkins and Mr. Mac Asbill for the petitioners.
536 537	
Kermode F. Gill, Surviving partner, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Benjamin Franklin Realty & Holding Company, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William W. Montgomery, Mr. Horace Andrews, and Mr. William P. Belden for the petitioners, and by Mr. Stanley Folz and Mr. Frederic L. Ballard for the respondents.
544	
Sherman & Ellis, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Indiana Mutual Casualty Company, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John R. Cochran for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles O. Roemler, Mr. William H. Thompson, and Mr. Albert L. Rabb for the respondents.
553	
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Mattie E. Case, Administratrix of the Estate of George M. Case, deceased.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward T. Miller, Mr. Lisbon E. Durham, and Mr. Henry S. Conrad for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mont S. Prewitt for the respondent.
554	

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
31 vs.
Sanford & Brooks Company.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Harry N. Baetjer for the respondent.

The United States of America,
112 vs.
Edward Benz.

This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the United States and by Mr. Francis Biddle for Benz.

Anna Uravic, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
32 vs.
F. Jarka Company, Inc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Raymond Parmer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ernie Adamson for the respondent.

Harold J. Coolidge, et al., Trustees, Appellants,
33 vs.
Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations, etc.;
Harold J. Coolidge, et al., Trustees, Appellants,
34 vs.
Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations, etc.

These cases were argued by Mr. Robert G. Dodge for the appellants, and by Mr. James S. Eastham for the appellee.

R. E. Graham and E. E. Foster, copartners, etc., Petitioners,
36 vs.
Rex B. Goodcell, former collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John E. Hughes for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harris H. Gilman, It is ordered that Robert E. Goodwin, Esquire, of Concord, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer Hoch, It is ordered that James M. Meek, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ray W. Mcdrow, It is ordered that Robert Van Pelt, Esquire, of Lincoln, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Henry Butler, It is ordered that Mitchell B. Carroll, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Wallace Booth, It is ordered that Robert A. Applegate, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer R. Hendricks, It is ordered that Ewing Everett, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer Thomas, It is ordered that William H. Lewis, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Carter, It is ordered that John W. Henderson, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Cable, It is ordered that Ernest C. Rarey, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

R. E. Graham and E. E. Foster, copartners, etc., Petitioners,
36 vs.
Rex B. Goodcell, Former Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. John E. Hughes for the petitioners, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1930 - CONTINUED

Percival E. Magee,		This case was argued by Mr. Theodore
	Petitioner,	B. Benson for the petitioner, and by
65 vs.		Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg
The United States.		for the respondent.

Oak Worsted Mills,		This case was argued by Mr. Theodore
	Petitioner,	B. Benson for the petitioner, and by
104 vs.		Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg
The United States.		for the respondent.

Taft Woolen Company,		This case was submitted to the considera-
	Petitioner,	tion of the Court by Mr. Theodore B.
105 vs.		Benson, Mr. Guil Barber, Mr. Chester
The United States.		F. Williams, Mr. William Meyerhoff, Mr.
		Percy A. Matthews, Mr. Frederick G.

Fischer, and Mr. Frank J. Albus for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. George H. Foster, Mr. Erwin N. Griswold, and Mr. Bradley B. Gilman for the respondent.

Second National Bank of Saginaw,		The argument of this case was commenced
	Petitioner,	by Mr. W. A. Sutherland for the peti-
323 vs.		tioner.
The United States.		

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elkan Turk, It is ordered that Benjamin Wiener, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ayres, It is ordered that Earl Whittier Shinn, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Camden R. McAtee, It is ordered that Joseph Denson Parish, Esquire, of West Palm Beach, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh H. Obear, It is ordered that Moses Louis Malevinsky, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Second National Bank of Saginaw,
Petitioner,
323 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. W. A. Sutherland for the petitioner.

Boston Pressed Metal Company,
Petitioner,
337 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Harry Friedman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

Daniel Reeves, Inc.,
Petitioner,
463 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, individually, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Elkan Turk for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.

Laura H. Jennings, as Executrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
529 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, individually, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Ewing Everett for the petitioner, and the case was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Norman D. Keller, Mr. John M. Hudson, and Mr. Edwin M. Griswold for the respondent.

Wright & Taylor, Inc.,
Petitioner,
565 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Collector of Internal Revenue.

This case was argued by Mr. Donald V. Hunter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.

American Glue Company,
Petitioner,
519 vs.
The United States of America.

The change in the corporate name of the petitioner from American Glue Company to Eastern Equities Corporation having been suggested,

It is on motion of counsel for the petitioner and pursuant to stipulation filed herein now here ordered by the Court that henceforth in this cause the petitioner shall be designated as Eastern Equities Corporation, formerly American Glue Company.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Eastern Equities Corporation,
Petitioner,
519 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Robert E. Goodwin for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Miller Kenyon, It is ordered that Gething C. Miller, Esquire, of Charlottesville, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. U. Ben Geaslin, It is ordered that J. Raymond Dyer, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David Wilner, It is ordered that Harry L. Mostow, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Eastern Equities Corporation,
Petitioner,
519 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Robert E. Goodwin for the petitioner.

The United States,
Petitioner,
416 vs.
Wyman, Partridge & Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank J. Albus for the respondent.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
Petitioner,
508 vs.
Erie Coal & Coke Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert A. Applegate for the respondent.

Roberts Sash & Door Company,
Petitioner,
97 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Jesse I. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

Mascot Oil Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
400 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Theodore B. Benson and Mr. W. A. Sutherland for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

Roy & Titcomb, Inc.,
Petitioner,
412 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Sidney P. Simpson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward Petrillo, It is ordered that Andrew J. Nowak, Esquire, of Erie, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Swindler, It is ordered that Robert H. Wendt, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Swindler, It is ordered that William E. Rodriguez, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Riordon, It is ordered that Will Freeman, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that J. A. Scarlett, Esquire, of DeLand, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert T. Scott, It is ordered that Bruce A. Sciotto, Esquire, of Indiana, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Alexis Green, It is ordered that Samuel W. Getzen, Esquire, of Bushnell, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Everett Sanders, It is ordered that Noble J. Johnson, Esquire, of Terre Haute, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Brenner, It is ordered that Samuel Weiss, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Orenstein and Koppel Aktiengesellschaft,

Petitioner,

59 vs.

Koppel Industrial Car and Equipment Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the writ of certiorari in this cause be dismissed, without costs to either party and that the mandate of this Court issue forthwith;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, and on motion of counsel for the petitioner, it is now here ordered by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, without costs to either party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Russian Volunteer Fleet,

Petitioner,

39 vs.

The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. William L. Rawls for the petitioner, and by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Pawcus Machine Company,

Petitioner,

40 vs.

The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Louis N. Ensten and Lion Knitting Mills Company,

Petitioner,

46 vs.

Simon Ascher & Company, Inc.

This case was argued by Mr. Harold E. Smith and Mr. O. Ellery Edwards for the petitioners, and by Mr. John F. Neary for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, December 15 next.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1930

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul B. Elcan, It is ordered that Willard W. Catchell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond S. Norris, It is ordered that Harold L. Turk, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rowland L. Johnston, It is ordered that Robert D. Durst, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Driver, It is ordered that Reece A. Caudle, Esquire, of Russellville, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roger O'Donnell, It is ordered that Robert M. Charles, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that Padjo Cravens, Esquire, of Ft. Smith, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Powers-Kennedy Contracting Corporation and Anthony C. Fleck, Petitioners,
3 vs.
Concrete Mixing and Conveying Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York with instructions to dismiss the bill of complaint.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Concrete Mixing and Conveying Company, Petitioner,
4 vs.
R. C. Storrie & Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

American Fruit Growers, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Brogdex Company. 46

On consideration of the motions on behalf of the States of Alabama, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas for leave to file a brief in this cause as amici curiae, and for leave to participate in the oral argument of the case,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the motion for leave to file brief herein as amici curiae be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that the motion for leave to participate in the oral argument of the case be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Broad River Power Company, Columbia Railway, Gas and Electric Company, and F. D. Campbell, Petitioners, vs. State of South Carolina ex rel. John M. Daniel, Attorney General. 528, October Term, 1929.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard further on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Concurring. Mr. Justice Van Devanter, Mr. Justice McReynolds, Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Roberts, considering himself disqualified, took no part in the decision of this case.

Kook Wing,

Petitioner,

307 vs.

Philippine Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Adele Kahle,

Petitioner,

540 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Nathaniel P. Pratt and George L. Pratt,

Petitioners,

536 vs.

Charles J. Weeks.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Nathaniel P. Pratt and George L. Pratt, Petitioners,
537 vs.
Charles J. Weeks.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Kermode F. Gill, Surviving partner of Kermode F. Gill and John T. Gill, Partners, Trading as John Gill & Sons, Petitioners,
544 vs.
Benjamin Franklin Realty & Holding Company, The Real Estate Land Title & Trust Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sherman & Ellis, Inc., Petitioner,
553 vs.
Indiana Mutual Casualty Company, a corporation, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner,
554 vs.
Mattie E. Case, Administratrix of the Estate of George M. Case, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arvey Moore, Petitioner,
562 vs.
Carter Oil Company.

On consideration of the motion to defer the consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause pending the filing and submission of a petition for writ of certiorari in the case of The Seminoles vs. Wise,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward A. Pagel, as Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
176 vs.
Selma Hallbom.

The death of Selma Hallbom and the appointment of John G. MacLean as administrator of the estate of Selma Hallbom, having been suggested,

It is on motion of counsel in behalf of counsel for the respondent now here ordered by the Court that John G. MacLean, Administrator of the estate of Selma Hallbom, deceased, be substituted as the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joe Drazich, Petitioner, 583 vs. Finch R. Archer, Warden.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joe Drazich pro se.
Yetta Stromberg, Appellant, 584 vs. The People of the State of California.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Beardsley for the appellant.
George H. Browne and Ada Victorine Carver, Petitioners, 588 vs. Victoria Pool, et al.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George H. Browne, pro se.
Elmer U. Wood, Ruth Edna Taylor, et al. Petitioners, 545 vs. The Employers' Liability Assurance Corporation, Limited, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Earl B. Barnes for the petitioners, and by Mr. John Rynerson and Mr. Donald P. Shinn for the respondent.
The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, 548 vs. Donnie Calloway, Administratrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. L. Bell, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. Thos. P. Littlepage, and Mr. W. R. Bleakmore for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, Mr. H. L. Stuart, and Mr. R. R. Bell for the respondent.

Nash-Breyer Motor Company, formerly Troy Motor Sales Company,

Petitioner,

549 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. B. Benson, Mr. Arthur H. Deibert, Mr. M. F. Mitchell, and Mr. George G. Witter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Louis A. Wilkerson,

Petitioner,

550 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry C. Hendrickson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

National Surety Company,

Petitioner,

557 vs.

Charles H. Holtzman, Collector, etc.;

National Surety Company,

Petitioner,

558 vs.

Charles H. Holtzman, Collector, etc.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Frank M. Parrish, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

National Surety Company,
Petitioner,
561 vs.
International Harvester Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph M. Shaw, Mr. Edward W. Everitt, Mr. Silas H. Strawn, and Mr. George T. Evans for the petitioner, and by Mr. William S. Elliott and Mr. J. F. Dammann for the respondent.

Arvey Moore,
Petitioner,
562 vs.
Carter Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas H. Owen, Mr. Chester I. Long, Mr. W. E. Stanley, Mr. Peter Q. Nyce, and Mr. Samuel W. McIntosh for the petitioner, and by Mr. James A. Veasey and Mr. Lloyd C. Owen for the respondent.

Crummies Creek Coal Company,
Petitioner,
566 vs.
Carrs Fork Coal Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph S. Laurent for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank E. Wood and Mr. Robert S. Marx for the respondents.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
569 vs.
General Railway Signal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Ewing and Mr. F. C. Dorety for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clifton V. Edwards, Mr. Amasa C. Paul, and Mr. Harry E. Knight for the respondent.

M. & J. Tracy, Inc., Owner, etc.,

Petitioner,

573 vs.

Northwestern Fire & Marine Insurance Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Crawley for the petitioner, and by Mr. William F. Purdy for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, January 5, 1931, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert A. Littleton, It is ordered that J. B. Milliken, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. McSwain, It is ordered that James D. Poag, Esquire, of Greenville, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Merillat, It is ordered that Thos. M. Gittings, Esquire of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul M. Segal, It is ordered that Hyman D. Landy, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Leo R. Friedman, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Merillat, It is ordered that Mortimer W. H. Cox, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney F. Andrews, It is ordered that Wilder Lucas, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Clinton R. White,
29 vs.
George E. Q. Johnson and H. D. Hayes.

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the certificate in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

American Bond and Mortgage Company and Trianon, Inc.,
210 vs.
United States of America.

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the certificate in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Pawcus Machine Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

40 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for

31 vs. the Fourth Circuit.

Sanford & Brooks Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Go-Bart Importing Co., Philip D. Gowen, and William Bartels, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

111

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York and the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, reversed.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York with directions to enjoin the United States Attorney and the special agent in charge of special agents of the Bureau of Prohibition from using the papers in question as evidence and to order the same returned to petitioners.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America, vs. Edward Benz.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

112

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America and
Interstate Commerce Commission,

Appellants, Appeal from the District Court of the
10 vs. United States for the Northern
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and District of Illinois.
Pacific Railroad Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this case. Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Stone in which Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur.

O'Gorman and Young, Incorporated,

Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Errors and
12 vs. Appeals of the State of New Jersey.
Hartford Fire Insurance Company
of Hartford, Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the Judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Separate opinion by Mr. Justice Van Devanter, Mr. Justice McReynolds, Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Butler.

O'Gorman and Young, Incorporated,

Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Errors and

13 vs. Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

Phoenix Assurance Company, Ltd.,
London.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Errors and Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Separate opinion by Mr. Justice Van Devanter, Mr. Justice McReynolds, Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Butler.

Charles H. Stange,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

23 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Annette Aiken, Administratrix of the
Estate of Friend M. Aiken, Deceased,

Petitioner,

69 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

W. P. Brown & Sons Lumber Company,

Petitioner,

115 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Chicago Railway Equipment Company.

231 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, so far as it relates to 1918 taxes, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, Lewis E. Gettle, Adolph Kannenberg, and A. R. McDonald, as Members Thereof, et al., etc., Appellants, vs. W. G. Maxcy, as Receiver of the Washburn Water Works Company, et al.

464 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Memphis & Charleston Railway Company,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

8 vs. State of Mississippi.

C. L. Pace, C. C. Stephens,

R. C. Grisham, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Anna Uravic, as Administratrix of the
Goods, Chattels, and Credits which
Were of Anton Uravic, Deceased,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Supreme

32 vs. Court of the State of New York,

Kings County.

F. Jarka Company, Inc., and
United American Line, Inc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Kings County, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Kings County, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of Florida and A. S. Wells,
E. S. Matthews, et al., etc.,

Appellants,

16 vs.

The United States of America,
Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the portion of the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission under review in this Court, with respect to intrastate rates, be set aside.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Brooks-Scanlon Corporation, Wilson Cypress Company, Cummer Cypress Company,

Appellants,

17 vs.

The United States of America,
Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the portion of the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission under review in this Court, with respect to intrastate rates, be set aside.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wilson Lumber Company of Florida,

Appellant,

18 vs.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the portion of the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission under review in this Court, with respect to intrastate rates, be set aside.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

L. M. Willcuts, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Minnesota, Petitioner,

22 vs.

Charles W. Bunn.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

539

Ex Parte:

Morton S. Hawkins, Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

539

Ex Parte:

Morton S. Hawkins, Petitioner.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joe Drazich,

Petitioner,

583 vs.

Finch R. Archer, Warden.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joe Drazich, Petitioner,
583 vs.
Finch R. Archer, Warden.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George H. Brown and Ada Victorine Carver, Petitioners,
588 vs.
Victoria Pool, A. Vaughn Pool, R. W. Sanders, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George H. Browne and Ada Victorine Carver, Petitioners,
588 vs.
Victoria Pool, A. Vaughn Pool, R. W. Sanders, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lektophone Corporation, Petitioner, vs. The Rola Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

19

Miller Brothers Company, Petitioner, vs. Lektophone Corporation. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

68

O R D E R.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the opinion of this Court in the above entitled cases, announced December 8, 1930, be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows:

The fourth sentence in the third paragraph is amended to read as follows:

"The contribution of Hopkins, if he made one, as held in several cases in the lower Courts and abroad, was to combine abandoning the sound box, determining the size of the cone deemed by him most suitable to reproduce the sounds communicated to it by vibration, and tightly gripping and rigidly supporting the outer edge of the above mentioned annular rim of the cone between two rings."

The ninth sentence in the fourth paragraph is amended to read as follows:

"To quote again from the last cited case, 'to hold that the defendant's device comprises "a tympanum rigidly supported at its periphery" within the meaning of the claims is to construe the claims contrary to the plain import of their terms.' "

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Nash-Breyer Motor Company, Formerly Troy Motor Sales Company, Petitioner, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. — Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

549

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Elmer U. Wood, Ruth Edna Taylor, Ruth Edna Taylor, Administratrix of the Estate of Hubert S. Taylor, Deceased, et al., Petitioners,
545 vs.
The Employer's Liability Assurance Corporation, Limited, of London, England.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
548 vs.
Donnie Calloway, Administratrix of the Estate of John C. Calloway, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louis A. Wilkerson, Petitioner,
550 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

National Surety Company,

Petitioner,

557 vs.

Charles H. Holtzman, Collector of Customs at the Port of Baltimore, Maryland.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

National Surety Company,

Petitioner,

558 vs.

Charles H. Holtzman, Collector of Customs at the Port of Baltimore, Maryland.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

National Surety Company,

Petitioner,

561 vs.

International Harvester Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Crummies Creek Coal Company,

Petitioner,

566 vs.

Carrs Fork Coal Company,
H. E. Bullock, Hiram Owens.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Great Northern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

569 vs.

General Railway Signal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

M. & J. Tracy, Inc., Owner of the Steamship "Michael Tracy,"

Petitioner,

573 vs.

Northwestern Fire & Marine Insurance Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ex parte: D. B. Daugherty, Petitioner, 21, Original.	The return of Honorable George W. McClintic to the rule to show cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher.
Group No. 1 Oil Corporation, Petitioner, 425 vs. James W. Bass, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.	The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.
The United States of America, Appellant, 606 vs. William H. Sprague and William J. Howey.	The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Frederic M. P. Pearse for the appellees in opposition thereto.
The State of Wisconsin, et al., Complainants, 6, Original. vs. The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.; State of Michigan, et al., Complainants, 10, Original. vs. The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.; State of New York, et al., Complainants, 11, Original. vs. State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.	The semiannual Report of the Sanitary District of Chicago was presented to the Court.

Ex parte:
E. Harper and C. E. Crigger,
23, Original. Petitioners.

The return of Honorable John E. Martineau to the rule to show cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles D. Frierson.

Charles Gugenhine,
Appellant,
527 vs.
Joseph A. Gerk.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Freeman L. Martin for the appellant.

William W. McBoyle,
Petitioner,
552 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry F. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Dexter & Carpenter, Inc.,
Petitioner,
560 vs.
Kunglig Jarnvagsstyrelsen, also known as The Royal Administration of the Swedish State Railways, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles S. Haight for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward B. Burling, Mr. William C. Cannon, and Mr. Porter R. Chandler for the respondents.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
563 vs.
Delmar Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. C. Dorety and Mr. R. J. Hagman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred W. Putnam for the respondent.

Minnie Pfeifer,
Petitioner,
564 vs.
Rosa B. Wright, as Executrix of the Estate of James H. Wright, deceased, and in her Personal Capacity.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Stone for the petitioner, and by Mr. V. P. Crowe for the respondent.

Susan Jane Brittain Motter and Samuel I. Motter, as Guardians ad litem, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
570 vs.
John S. Brittain III, by his Guardian ad litem, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel W. Fordyce and Mr. Henry J. Richardson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Robert A. Brown for the respondent.

William J. Kyle, Petitioner,
571 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
Patrick D. Reinhart, Petitioner,
572 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Seifert and Mr. William Wallace Booth for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewell Key, Mr. Norman D. Keller, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

General Motors Corporation,
Petitioner,
575 vs.
The Swan Carburetor Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence C. Spieth and Mr. J. L. Stackpole for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harrison B. McGraw, Mr. Joseph H. Milans, and Mr. F. O. Richey for the respondent.

Ewing-Thomas Converting Company, Petitioner,
576 vs.
Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Craig Peacock for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Joseph Bourke, Claimant of 150 Bags of Assorted Canadian Liquors, Petitioner,
577 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leonard S. Coyne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. F. Cadmus Damrell, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Joseph H. Brierley and Arthur J. Fleming, Receivers, etc., Petitioners,
578 vs.
Commercial Credit Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank A. Harrington and Mr. Arthur E. Weil for the petitioners, and by Mr. Duane R. Dills for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
579 vs.
Kate Fowler Merle Smith.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assitant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Norman D. Keller, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
580 vs.
Margaret B. Fowler.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent.

Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner,
581 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,
Petitioner,
585 vs.
Harry E. Cole.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Murray Allen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clyde A. Douglass and Mr. Robert N. Simms for the respondent.

Jules Schnerb and Joseph Wegimont,
Petitioners,
589 vs.
Caterpillar Tractor Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gregory Hankin, Mr. William H. Page, and Mr. William Harvey Smith for the petitioners, and by Mr. John Thomas Smith for the respondent.

Zurich General Accident & Liability Insurance Company, Limited,
Petitioner,
592 vs.
Charles J. O'Keefe.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry B. Morrow, Mr. Ralph F. Potter, and Mr. George A. Bangs for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. J. Murphy for the respondent.

Eagle Star & British Dominions Insurance Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
595 vs.
Niagara Ferry & Transportation Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Erie County, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll Single for the petitioners, and by Mr. Ray M. Stanley for the respondent.

American Can Company,
Petitioner,
598 vs.
Ladoga Canning Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Thompson, Mr. Albert L. Rabb, Mr. Garrard B. Winston, Mr. John A. Garver, Mr. Lemuel A. Welles, and Mr. Leonard B. Smith for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solon J. Carter, Mr. Harold K. Bachelder, and Mr. William C. Bachelder for the respondent.

Directoplane Corporation,
Petitioner,
599 vs.
Heubner-Bleistein Patents Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Glen E. Smith, Mr. Reeve Lewis, and Mr. Frank Parker Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. George I. Haight and Mr. Samuel W. Banning for the respondent.

The State of Louisiana,
Complainant,
8, Original. vs.
The State of Mississippi.

This case was submitted on the exceptions of the defendant to the report of the special master by Mr. H. H. Creekmore, Mr. Rufus Creekmore, Mr. E. C. Sharp, and Mr. Rush H. Knox for the defendant in support of the exceptions, and by Mr. Percy Saint, Mr. Gerard Brandon, Mr. John Dale, and Mr. Robert Ash for the complainant in opposition thereto.

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
12, Original. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The argument of this case on the exceptions of the complainant to the report of the Special Master was commenced by Mr. Ernest L. Averill for the complainants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Hostetler, It is ordered that Ellis Spear Middleton, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tracy L. Jeffords, It is ordered that James H. Clendening, Jr., Esquire, of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard K. Stevens, It is ordered that Thomas Wallace Quinn, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alexander Goodman, It is ordered that Erwin I. Feldman, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Dill, It is ordered that Maurice A. Langhorne, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. U. S. Webb, It is ordered that Simeon Ekwick Sheffey, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel O. Hastings, It is ordered that Abel Klaw, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, It is ordered that Robert E. Bronson, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

The United States of America,
Appellant,
606 vs.
William H. Sprague and William J. Howey.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Wednesday, January 21 next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Connecticut,

Complainant,

12, Original. vs.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The argument of this case on the exceptions of the complainant to the report of the Special Master was continued by Mr. Ernest L. Averill for the complainant, by Mr. Bentley W. Warren for the defendant, and concluded by Mr. Benedict M. Holden for the complainant.

J. W. Alford,

Petitioner,

370 vs.

The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Leo R. Friedman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the respondent.

Aaron Prussian,

Petitioner,

448 vs.

The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Harold L. Turk for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Sisson for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis Beall Kent, It is ordered that Charles Harwood, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that Charles W. Mulcahy, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Kerr, It is ordered that Hugo Monnig, Jr., Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Kerr, It is ordered that George G. Willson, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Harry H. Byrer, Esquire, of Martinsburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Aaron Prussian,
Petitioner,
448 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Sisson for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Harold L. Turk for the petitioner.

International Paper Company,
Petitioner,
37 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Axel Langnes, owner of the Diesel Halibut Vessel "Aloha," her engines, etc.,
Petitioner,
38 vs.
Winfield A. Green, Claimant.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Robert E. Bronson for the petitioner and continued by Mr. Winter S. Martin for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 8, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Hamel, It is ordered that William J. Carr, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence A. Lawlor, It is ordered that Leo M. Harlow, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harvey D. Jacob, It is ordered that Hugh F. O'Donnell, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harvey D. Jacob, It is ordered that Archibald M. Jordan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert G. Simmons, It is ordered that Thomas F. Neighbors, Esquire, of Scottsbluff, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burnett M. Chiperfield, It is ordered that Russell O. Manson, Esquire, of Ottawa, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fritz Garland Lanham, It is ordered that B. G. Mansell, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that Granville Coe Parrier, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Axel Langnes, Owner of the Diesel Halibut Vessel "Aloha," her engines, etc., Petitioner,

38 vs.

Winfield A. Green, Claimant.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Winter S. Martin for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Robert E. Bronson for the petitioner.

Leslie T. Alward, Petitioner,

41 vs.

C. G. Johnson, Treasurer of the State of California.

This case was argued by Mr. Simeon E. Sheffey for the petitioner, and by Mr. U. S. Webb for the respondent.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 8, 1931 - CONTINUED

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

42 vs.

Boston Buick Company;

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

43 vs.

Iron Cap Copper Company.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Charles W. Mulcahy for the respondent in No. 42.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden Bacon, It is ordered that Leslie J. Tompkins, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas H. Gibson, It is ordered that Clarence L. Ireland, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Selden Bacon, It is ordered that Daniel F. Cohalan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward Seaburn Brashears, It is ordered that A. Rushton Allen, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard M. Cox, It is ordered that John A. Marzall, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert T. M. McCready, It is ordered that W. Brown Morton, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert T. M. McCready, It is ordered that Clarence M. Fisher, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard M. Cox, It is ordered that Roy H. Olson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert T. M. McCready, It is ordered that George E. Middleton, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
42 vs.
Boston Buick Company;
The United States of America,
Petitioner,
43 vs.
Iron Cap Copper Company.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Burton E. Eames for the respondent in No. 43, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the petitioner.

The United States,
Petitioner,
56 vs.
Swift and Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. Carroll Todd for the respondent.

The Pottstown Iron Company,
Petitioner,
113 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Paul F. Myers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

Fullerton Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
47 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific R. R. Co.

This case was argued by Mr. Stanley S. Gillam for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. C. Erdall for the respondent.

American Fruit Growers, Inc.,
Petitioner,
48 vs.
Brogdex Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. Brown Morton for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry S. Elkins, It is ordered that Lucien V. Axtell, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dean Hill Stanley, It is ordered that Henry H. Nordlinger, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. A. Rittenhouse, It is ordered that H. C. Thurman, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert L. Hopkins, It is ordered that Harry O. Bentley, Esquire, of Lima, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sam B. Hratton, It is ordered that Humphrey B. Hamilton, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. A. Rittenhouse, It is ordered that Frank G. Anderson, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Mathews, It is ordered that Francis Alan Patten, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Aaron Youngquist, It is ordered that John H. Hougen, Esquire, of Crookston, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Timothy T. Ansberry, It is ordered that Daniel P. Murphy, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that W. W. Dykes, Esquire, of Americus, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Timothy T. Ansberry, It is ordered that Edward Chase Crowley, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tasker L. ~~Oddie~~ Oddie, It is ordered that Arthur Gray Washburn, Esquire, of Reno, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Educational Films Corporation of America,

Appellant,

350 vs.

Hamilton Ward, Attorney General of the State of New York, and Thomas M. Lynch, et al., etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Sutherland in which Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice Butler concur.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of Wisconsin, et al., Complainants,
6, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.;
The State of Michigan, et al., Complainants,
10, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.;
The State of New York, et al., Complainants,
11, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.

The semi-annual report of the Sanitary District of Chicago dated January 1, 1931, is received and ordered to be filed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

21, Original.

Ex parte: D. B. Daugherty, Petitioner.

On petition for writ of mandamus and on rule to show cause thereupon issued.

On consideration of the return of the Honorable George W. McClintic, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia to the rule, issued in this case, to show cause why a writ of mandamus should not issue herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said rule be, and the same is hereby, discharged, and that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to an application to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ex Parte: E. Harper and C. E. Crigger, On petition for writ of mandamus and
23, Original. Petitioners, on rule to show cause thereupon issued.

On consideration of the return of the Honorable John E. Martineau, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas to the rule, issued in this case, to show cause why a writ of mandamus should not issue herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said rule be, and the same is hereby, discharged, and that the petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Group No. 1 Oil Corporation,
Petitioner,
425 vs.
James W. Bass, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 24th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles B. Cugenhine,
Appellant,
527 vs.
Joseph A. Gerk, Chief of Police, etc., and Stratton Shartel, Attorney General of the State of Missouri.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles B. Gugenhine,

Appellant,

527 vs.

Joseph A. Gerk, Chief of Police, etc., and Stratton Shartel, Attorney General of the State of Missouri.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William W. McBoyle,

Petitioner,

552 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted, the argument and briefs to be limited to the question whether the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act applies to aircraft. The case is advanced and assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 24th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., Administrator of the Estate of Edgar M. Morsman,

Petitioner,

581 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument immediately following the hearing of case No. 535, Commissioner of Internal Revenue vs. Northern Trust Company, Executor, etc.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cyrus H. McCormick, et al., Executors, etc., Petitioners,

542 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

ORDER.

It is ordered that this case be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument immediately following the hearing of case No. 581, Morsman, Administrator, etc. vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dexter & Carpenter, Inc., Petitioner,

560 vs.

Kunglig Jarnvagsstyrelsen, also known as The Royal Administration of the Swedish State Railways, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Minnie Pfeifer, Petitioner,

564 vs.

Rosa B. Wright, as Executrix of the Estate of James H. Wright, Deceased and in her Personal Capacity.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles B. Gugenhine,

Appellant,

527 vs.

Joseph A. Gerk, Chief of Police, etc., and Stratton Shartel, Attorney General of the State of Missouri.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William W. McBoyle,

Petitioner,

552 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted, the argument and briefs to be limited to the question whether the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act applies to aircraft. The case is advanced and assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 24th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., Administrator of the Estate of Edgar M. Morsman,

Petitioner,

581 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument immediately following the hearing of case No. 535, Commissioner of Internal Revenue vs. Northern Trust Company, Executor, etc.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cyrus H. McCormick, et al., Executors, etc., Petitioners,
542 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

ORDER.

It is ordered that this case be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument immediately following the hearing of case No. 581, Morsman, Administrator, etc. vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dexter & Carpenter, Inc., Petitioner,
560 vs.
Kunglig Jarnvagsstyrelsen, also known as The Royal Administration of the Swedish State Railways, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Minnie Pfeifer, Petitioner,
564 vs.
Rosa B. Wright, as Executrix of the Estate of James H. Wright, Deceased and in her Personal Capacity.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Susan Jane Brittain Motter and Samuel I. Motter, as Guardians ad Litem for Susan Brittain Motter, et al., Petitioners,

570 vs.

John S. Brittain (III), by his Guardian ad Litem, Vella Brittain, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William J. Kyle, Petitioner,

571 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Patrick D. Reinhart, Petitioner,

572 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

General Motors Corporation,

Petitioner,

575 vs.

The Swan Carburetor Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ewing-Thomas Converting Company,

Petitioner,

576 vs.

Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph Bourke, Claimant of 150 Bags of Assorted Canadian Liquors,

Petitioner,

577 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph H. Brierley, and Arthur J. Fleming, Receivers of William H. Lorimer's Sons Co., Petitioners,
578 vs.
Commercial Credit Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
579 vs.
Kate Fowler Merle-Smith.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
580 vs.
Margaret B. Fowler.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
585 vs.
Harry E. Cole.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jules Schnerb and Joseph Wegimont, Petitioners,
589 vs.
Caterpillar Tractor Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Zurich General Accident & Liability Insurance Company, Limited, Petitioner,
592 vs.
Charles J. O'Keefe.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Eagle Star & British Dominions Insurance Company, Automobile Insurance Company, et al., Petitioners,
595 vs.
Niagara Ferry & Transportation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Erie County.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Erie County, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Can Company, Petitioner,
598 vs.
Ladoga Canning Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Directoplane Corporation, Petitioner,
599 vs.
Huebner-Bleistein Patents Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
535 vs.
Northern Trust Company, Executor, etc.;
Cyrus H. McCormick, et al., Executors, etc., Petitioners,
542 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
581 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
Blakely D. McCaughn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
628 vs.
Zelia Cross Carnill, Executrix, etc.;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
644 vs.
Jennie L. Hodgkins, Surviving Executrix, etc.

The motion to advance these cases to be heard immediately following the hearing of case No. 387, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in that behalf.

The State of Arizona, Complainant,
19, Original. vs.
The State of California, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file motions to dismiss the bill of complaint in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is assigned for argument on the motions to dismiss on Monday, March 9 next. It is also ordered that the brief for the complainant be served upon the Solicitor General Two weeks prior to that date.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John William McKissick, et al., Appellants,
316 vs.
Adolphus R. Talbot, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Isaac E. Ferguson for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. Charles W. Lyon and Mr. Leslie C. Pefferle for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
563 vs.
Delmar Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Cynther Storaasli, Appellant,
393 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

The joint motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Clague in behalf of counsel.

—, Original,
Ex parte: Delaware Bay and River Pilots Association, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto Wolff, Jr., for the petitioner.

Georgia Public Service Commission, et al., Appellants,
555 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar Watkins, Mr. Mac Asbill, Mr. Luther M. Walter, Mr. John S. Burchmore, and Mr. Nuel D. Belnap for the appellants.

Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
601 vs.
The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leo P. Day for the appellants.

W. J. McCahan Sugar Refining and Molasses Company, et al., Petitioners,
582 vs.
Augustus P. Norton, Deputy Commissioner of the Third Compensation District, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maurice W. Sloan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Mortimer W. H. Cox, Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. W. Clifton Stone, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondents.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
593 vs.
E. B. Link.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Murray Allen for the petitioner, and by Mr. James D. Poag for the respondent.

King Amusement Company, Petitioner,
594 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Abraham J. Levin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. John G. Remey, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Carl Hauptman, R. H. Johnstone, et al., Petitioners,
597 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert W. Jennings for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
600 vs.
J. L. Powe, as Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Davis and Mr. Arthur R. Young for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lionel K. Leggee and Mr. W. Turner Logan for the respondent.

Atlantic Transport Co. of West Virginia, Petitioner,
602 vs.
Theresa Kopfinger.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cletus Keating for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles A. Ellis for the respondent.

Farmers Bank of Bates County, Missouri, Petitioner,
603 vs.
Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cyrus Crane for the petitioner, and by Mr. Maurice H. Winger for the respondent.

Peoples Bank, Petitioner,
604 vs.
Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cyrus Crane for the petitioner, and by Mr. Maurice H. Winger for the respondent.

Missouri State Bank, Petitioner, 605 vs. Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred A. Boxley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Maurice H. Winger for the respondent.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 644 vs. Jennie L. Hodgkins, Surviving Executrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner.
The United States of America, 512 vs. Robert K. Malcolm.	This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, and Miss Helen R. Carloss for the United States, and by Mr. Kingman Brewster, Mr. James S. Y. Ivins and Mr. Allen G. Wright for Malcolm.
American Fruit Growers, Inc., Petitioner, 48 vs. Brogdex Company.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. W. Brown Morton for the petitioner, by Mr. Charles Neave for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. R. T. M. McCready for the petitioner, with leave to the respondent to file additional brief on or before Friday next if so advised.

Bain Peanut Company of Texas, et al.,
Appellants,
49 vs.
Dave Pinson and C. B. Guyger.

This case was argued by Mr. B. C. Mansell for the appellants, and the case was submitted by Mr. Gib Callaway and Mr. Mark Callaway for the appellees.

Wisconsin Electric Company,
Petitioner,
50 vs.
The Dumore Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George Bayard Jones for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert R. Hendon, It is ordered that Charles Hall Johnston, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph L. Carr, It is ordered that Kenneth W. Robinson, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert R. Hendon, It is ordered that Joseph Vincent Walsh, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph L. Carr, It is ordered that Theodore E. Rein, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert R. Hendon, It is ordered that David Snow, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wisconsin Electric Company,
Petitioner,
50 vs.
The Dumore Company.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. George Bayard Jones for the petitioner. No appearance was entered for the respondent.

Saranac Automatic Machine Corporation,
Petitioner,
51 vs.
Wirebounds Patents Company, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Howard M. Cox for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Laurence A. Janney for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Amasa C. Paul for the petitioner.

W. C. Clark,
Appellant,
52 vs.
A. J. Maxwell, Commissioner of Revenue for the State of North Carolina.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Albert L. Cox for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
53 vs.
Willingham Loan and Trust Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Sisson for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. C. Murphy for the respondent.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana) et al.,
Appellants,
378 vs.
The United States of America.

Five hours allowed for the argument of this case. The argument was commenced by Mr. C. B. Ames for the primary appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-m rrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Neave, It is ordered that William D. Whitney, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Goldthwaite H. Dorr, It is ordered that Archie O. Dawson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Leahy, It is ordered that James F. Reilly, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana) et al., Appellants,
vs.
378 The United States of America.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. C. B. Ames for the primary appellants, by Mr. G. H. Dorr for the secondary appellants, by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the appellee, and by Mr. Charles Neave for the primary appellants.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Gower, It is ordered that William J. Hotz, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Warren Olney, It is ordered that Robert L. Lipman, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana) et al., Appellants,
378 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Charles Neave for the primary appellants.

Concordia Insurance Company of Milwaukee, Petitioner,
278 vs.
School District No. 98 of Payne County, State of Oklahoma;
Royal Insurance Company, Ltd., Petitioner,
279 vs.
School District No. 98 of Payne County, State of Oklahoma;
National Fire Insurance Company, Petitioner,
280 vs.
School District No. 98 of Payne County, State of Oklahoma;
Fire Association of Philadelphia, Petitioner,
281 vs.
School District No. 98 of Payne County, State of Oklahoma.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. F. A. Rittenhouse for the petitioners, and concluded by Mr. Frank G. Anderson for the respondent on the question of interest.

Louisville & Nashville R. R. Co. et al., Appellants,
333 vs.
The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

Three and one-half hours allowed for the argument of this case. The argument was commenced by Mr. Alfred P. Thom for the appellants, and continued by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wyndham R. Meredith, It is ordered that Collins Denny, Jr., Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, et al., Appellants,
333 vs.
The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Alfred P. Thom for the appellants.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
517 vs.
The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission.

This case was argued by Mr. Samuel W. Moore for the appellants, and by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the appellees.

Carbice Corporation of America,
Petitioner,
54 vs.
American Patents Development Corporation and Dry Ice Corporation of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Goodwin, It is ordered that Robert R. Duncan, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence B. Des Jardines, It is ordered that Edmund B. Whitcomb, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that George A. Cooke, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Lowrance, It is ordered that Nathan W. Thompson, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that Milton J. Foreman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Boyle, Jr., It is ordered that Aksel M. Pedersen, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Joseph L. McAleer, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth McKellar, It is ordered that L. D. Bejach, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Aaron Youngquist, It is ordered that John C. Remey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Aaron Youngquist, It is ordered that Mayner N. Larson, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Aaron Youngquist, It is ordered that Amos W. W. Woodcock, Esquire, of Salisbury, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Paul W. Kear, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Wm. Cutler Thompson, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude A. Fuller, It is ordered that John R. Duty, Esquire, of Rogers, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Williams, It is ordered that Jeremiah M. Evarts, Esquire, of Windsor, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Boyle, Jr., It is ordered that Martin T. Fisher, Esquire, of Washington, District of of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

International Paper Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

37 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby reversed and that this cause be and the same is hereby remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds, Mr. Justice Stone, and Mr. Justice Roberts.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

—, Original.
Ex Parte: Delaware Bay and River Pilots Association, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John William McKissick and D. W. Wright, Appellants,
316 vs.
Adolphus R. Talbot, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 24 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gynther Storaasli, Appellant,
393 vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the joint motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 24 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Etta M. Klein, former Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
387 vs.
The United States.

ORDER.

It is now here ordered by this Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 24 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Northern Trust Company, Executor, etc.; Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., Administrator, etc., Petitioner, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue; Cyrus H. McCormick, et al., Executors, etc., Petitioner, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	On consideration of the motion to advance these causes for argument immediately following case No. 387, Etta M. Klein, former administratrix, etc., vs. The United States, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
Georgia Public Service Commission, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, et al.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railway Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, et al.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
The United States of America, vs. Robert K. Malcolm.	On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the negative and that the second question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bain Peanut Company of Texas and United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Appellants,
49 vs.
Dave Pinson and G. B. Guyger.

Appeal from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eleventh Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eleventh Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and on motion to dismiss which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. C. Clark, Appellant,
52 vs.
A. J. Maxwell, Commissioner of Revenue for the State of North Carolina.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Amanda D. Hargis, Commissioner of Labor and Industrial Inspection of the State of Missouri, Appellant,
217 vs.
A. T. Bradford.

It is ordered by the Court that cause be shown by the appellant and appellee in the above entitled cause, on or before Tuesday, February 24, 1931, why the interlocutory decree of the specially constituted District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, entered herein March 15, 1930, should not be vacated and the cause remanded to that court with directions to dismiss the case as moot.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
563 vs.
Delmar Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,
600 vs.
J. L. Powe, as Administrator of George A. Marshall, Deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. J. McCahan Sugar Refining and Molasses Company and Maryland Casualty Company, Petitioners,
582 vs.
Augustus P. Norton, Deputy Commissioner for the Third Compensation District of the United States Employee's Compensation Commission, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
593 vs.
E. B. Link.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

King Amusement Company, Petitioner,
594 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Carl Hauptman, R. H. Johnstone and Clint Griffith, Petitioners,
597 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Atlantic Transport Co. of West Virginia,

Petitioner,

602 vs.

Theresa Kopfinger.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Farmers Bank of BatesCounty, Missouri,

Petitioner,

603 vs.

Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Peoples Bank,

Petitioner,

604 vs.

Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Missouri State Bank,

Petitioner,

605 vs.

Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

V. Loewers Gambrinus Brewery Company, Petitioner,

352 vs.

Charles W. Anderson, Individually, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Houston Thompson, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Frank S. Bright and H. Stanley Hinrichs, as amici curiae, in this cause.

A. Spates Brady,

Appellant,

632 vs.

The United States of America, et al.

The motion to advance this case to be heard following the hearing of case No. 384 was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George T. Bell for the appellant.

De Forest Radio Company,

Petitioner,

630 vs.

General Electric Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Martin T. Fisher, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of The Chemical Foundation, Inc., and others as amici curiae, in this cause.

Gene Buck, as President of the American Society of Composers, etc., et al., 138 vs. Jewell-La Salle Realty Company; Gene Buck, as President of the American Society of Composers, etc., et al. 139 vs. Jewell-La Salle Realty Company.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. Louis C. Caldwell, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of National Association of Broadcasters, Inc., as amicus curiae, in this cause.
The United States of America, Appellant, 606 vs. William H. Sprague, et al.	On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of J. M. Ewarts, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
H. Ely Goldsmith, Petitioner, 662 vs. A. C. Aderholt, as Warden, etc.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Ely Goldsmith, pro se.
Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, Petitioner, 543 vs. Noah Moquin.	The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tom Davis and Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. Henry S. Mitchell and Mr. John E. Palmer for the petitioner in opposition thereto.
Joe C. Lamm, Appellant, 546 vs Silver Falls Timber Company.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur I. Moulton for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. I. H. Van Winkle, Mr. Charles A. Hart, and Mr. Charles E. McCulloch for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Charles W. Varrelman, Appellant, 547 vs. Flora Logging Company.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur I. Moulton for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. I. H. Van Winkle, for the appellee, in opposition thereto.
The United States of America, Appellant, 606 vs. William H. Sprague, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the appellant.
Charles R. Berney, Petitioner, 586 vs. The United States of America; Maurice Bloom, Petitioner, 587 vs. The United States of America.	The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Halle for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Keifer, Mr. A. E. Gotschall, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.
Wyoming National Bank of Casper, Wyoming, Petitioner, 608 vs. Omaha National Bank, of Omaha, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hallock F. Rose, Mr. Arthur R. Wells, and Mr. Paul L. Martin for the respondent.

Sheppard and Myers, Incorporated,
Petitioner,
609 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. McCarron for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Miss Helen R. Carloss, Mr. Paul D. Miller, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

The Daily Pantagraph, Incorporated,
Petitioner,
62 vs.
The United States.

This case was submitted by Mr. Arnold L. Guesmer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Joseph H. Sheppard for the respondent.

Carbice Corporation of America,
Petitioner,
54 vs.
American Patents Development Corporation and Dry Ice Corporation of America.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Charles Neave for the respondent.

Railway Express Agency, Inc.,
Appellant,
55 vs.
The Commonwealth of Virginia.

This case was argued by Mr. Albert M. Hartung for the appellant, and by Mr. Collins Denny, Jr., for the appellee.

Story Parchment Company,
Petitioner,
57 vs.
Paterson Parchment Paper Company, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Isadore Levin for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Shelby S. Faulkner, It is ordered that Ellis Manning, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank H. Gaines, It is ordered that Seymour S. Sidner, Esquire, of Fremont, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. A. Sorensen, It is ordered that Charles E. Abbott, Esquire, of Fremont, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Jesse R. Dorsey, Esquire, of Bakersfield, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fontaine C. Bradley, It is ordered that John E. Wing, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, It is ordered that Harold A. Mesler, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

The United States of America, Appellant, 606 vs. William H. Sprague, et al.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
The United States of America, Appellant, 606 vs. William H. Sprague, et al.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. C. Russell Riordon, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of William H. Chrichton-Clarke, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
Story Parchment Company, Petitioner, 57 vs. Paterson Parchment Paper Company, et al.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the respondents and concluded by Mr. Edward O. Proctor for the petitioner.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1931 - CONTINUED

Oxford Paper Company, Petitioner, 58 vs. Steamship "Nidarholm," A. S. Nidaros.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John W. Lowrence for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Robert E. Goodwin for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Nathan W. Thompson for the petitioner.
U. G. Denman, Administrator, etc., Petitioner, 60 vs. W. L. Slayton.	This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas O. Marlar for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Julius Henry Cohen, It is ordered that Burton A. Zorn, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Clarke Mason, It is ordered that F. Lyman Windolph, Esquire, of Lancaster, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl E. Mapes, It is ordered that Leslie P. Whelan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley L. Jones, It is ordered that John A. Homer, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
606 vs.
William H. Sprague, et al.

The motion for leave to file brief of Moses J. Konnoson, as amicus curiae, in this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in behalf of Mr. Moses J. Konnoson, and the motion was denied.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
606 vs.
William H. Sprague, et al.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Henry W. Jessup, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
606 vs.
William H. Sprague, et al.

The motion for leave to file brief of National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People, as amicus curiae, in this cause, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur B. Spingarn in that behalf, and the motion was denied.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
606 vs.
William H. Sprague, et al.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Eliot Tuckerman, as amicus curiae, in this cause,

The United States of America,
Appellant,
606 vs.
William H. Sprague, et al.

Four hours allowed for the oral argument of this case. It was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the appellant, and by Mr. Julius Henry Cohen and Mr. Selden Bacon for the appellees.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

61 vs.

Niagara Falls Brewing Company, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Basil Robillard for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

109 vs.

National Industrial Alcohol Company, Inc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. R. M. O'Hara for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Rosen, It is ordered that Isaac Davis Stamps Farrar, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Rosen, It is ordered that E. Howard McCaleb, Jr., Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Hostetler, It is ordered that Nathaniel Frucht, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph E. Updike, It is ordered that John T. Haughey, Esquire, of Storm Lake, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold E. Lesler, It is ordered that Percy Franklin Parrott, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

109 vs.

National Industrial Alcohol Company, Inc.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. R. M. O'Hara for the respondent.

V. Loewers Gambrinus Brewery Company,

Petitioner,

352 vs.

Charles W. Anderson, Individually and as Collector, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Arthur B. Hyman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Richard Husty and Charles Laurel,

Petitioners,

477 vs.

The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Harold A. Kesler for the petitioners, and by Mr. Amos W. W. Woodcock for the respondent.

Abie State Bank,

Appellant,

63 vs.

Arthur J. Weaver, as Governor of the State of Nebraska, et al., etc.

The expiration of office of Arthur J. Weaver, as Governor of the State of Nebraska, and the expiration of office of Willis M. Stebbins, as Treasurer of the State of Nebraska, having been suggested,

Wherefore, on consideration of the joint motion of counsel to substitute Charles W. Bryan, present Governor, and T. W. Bass, present Treasurer, as parties appellees in this cause in place of Arthur J. Weaver, former Governor, and Willis M. Stebbins, former Treasurer, respectively,

It is now here ordered that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Abie State Bank,

Appellant,

63 vs.

Charles W. Bryan, as Governor of the State of Nebraska, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Leonard S. Flansburg for the appellant, and continued by Mr. C. A. Sorensen for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John H. Holt, It is ordered that Robert E. McCabe, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carroll L. Beedy, It is ordered that Roy L. Fernald, Esquire, of Winterport, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Florida, et al.,
Appellants,
16 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
Brooks-Scanlon Corporation, et al.,
Appellants,
17 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
Wilson Lumber Company of Florida,
Appellant,
18 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The motions to withhold the issuance of the mandates in these cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blair Foster for the appellee, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, and The Georgia Public Service Commission, with leave to the appellants to file an opposition thereto within five days, on motion of Mr. H. P. Adair for the appellants.

International Paper Company,
Petitioner,
37 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to issue the mandate forthwith in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Abie State Bank,
Appellant,
63 vs.
Charles W. Bryan, Governor of the State of Nebraska, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. G. A. Sorensen and Mr. Charles E. Abbott for the appellees, Charles W. Bryan, Governor, et al.; by Mr. William J. Hotz for the intervening appellees, Mary E. Gandy, et al.; and concluded by Mr. Frank H. Gaines for the appellant.

Northport Power & Light Company,
Appellant,
66 vs.
Roland H. Hartley, as Governor of the State of Washington, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. O. C. Moore for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Michael Adams,
Petitioner,
71 vs.
New York Trust Company, Trustee.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles Rosen for the respondent, and the case was submitted by Mr. Michael Adam, pro se, and Mr. Richard A. Dowling for the petitioner.

B. K. Isaacs, as Trustee, etc.
72 vs.
Hobbs Tie & Timber Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William R. Watkins for Isaacs, Trustee, and by Mr. John R. Duty for Hobbs Tie & Timber Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George R. Stobbs, It is ordered that Frank B. Bozza, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Newell W. Ellison, It is ordered that Abraham Redman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Willingham Loan and Trust Company. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

53

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

R. B. Graham and E. E. Foster, Copartners,
Doing Business under the Firm Name of
Millie Francis Oil Company, a
Copartnership, Petitioners,
36 vs.
Rex B. Goodcell, Former Collector of
Internal Revenue of the United States
of America in and for the Sixth Collection
District, State of California.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Oak Worsted Mills,
Petitioner,
104 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Taft Woolen Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

105 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Second National Bank of Saginaw, Saginaw,
Michigan, Trustee of the Estate of
Wellington R. Burt, Deceased, On writ of certiorari to the

Petitioner, Court of Claims.

323 vs.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Boston Pressed Metal Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

337 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Daniel Reeves, Inc.,

Petitioner,

463 vs.

Charles W. Anderson, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Laura H. Jennings, as Executrix of the Last Will and Testament of Frederic B. Jennings, Deceased, Petitioner,

529 vs.

Charles W. Anderson, Individually and as United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wright & Taylor, Inc.,

Petitioner,

565 vs.

Robert H. Lucas, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Kentucky.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Eastern Equities Corporation,

Petitioner,

519 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Percival K. Magee,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

65 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mascot Oil Company, Inc.,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

400 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

416 vs. Court of Claims.

Wyman, Partridge & Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal
Revenue for the Twenty-third District
of Pennsylvania, Petitioner,
508 vs.
Erie Coal & Coke Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Roy & Titcomb, Inc.,
Petitioner,
412 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Roberts Sash & Door Company,

Petitioner,

97 vs.

The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

H. Ely Goldsmith,

Petitioner,

662 vs.

A. C. Aderholt, as Warden, United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

H. Ely Goldsmith,

Petitioner,

662 vs.

A. C. Aderholt, as Warden, United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. Spates Brady,

Appellant,

632 vs.

The United States of America, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case for argument following case No. 384,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company,

Petitioner,

543 vs.

Noah Moquin.

It is now here ordered by this Court that further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm herein be, and the same is hereby, postponed to the hearing of the case on its merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joe C. Lamm,

Appellant,

546 vs.

Silver Falls Timber Company.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles W. Varrelman,

Appellant,

547 vs.

Flora Logging Company.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Wisconsin Electric Company, Petitioner, vs. The Dumore Company. 50

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Daily Pantagraph, Incorporated, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 62

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and on confession of error by the respondent, the United States.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, so far as it relates to the question of the reduction of invested capital by reason of dividends paid, be, and the same is hereby, reversed.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the judgment of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Michael Adam,

Petitioner,

71 vs.

The New York Trust Company, Trustee.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles R. Berney,

Petitioner,

586 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Maurice Bloom,

Petitioner,

587 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wyoming National Bank of Casper, Wyoming, Petitioner, vs. Omaha National Bank of Omaha, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, Missouri, et al.

608 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sheppard and Myers, Incorporated, Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

609 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order:

O R D E R.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, February 2, until Tuesday, February 24 next.

The United States of America ex rel. Ethel M. McLennan,
Petitioner,
618 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the respondent to postpone the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this case until February 24 next,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Utah.

The Complainants' exceptions to the report of the special master herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the complainant.

The United States of America,
Complainant,
14, Original. vs.
The State of Utah.

The defendant's exceptions to the report of the special master herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Parker, Mr. Waldemar Van Cott, Mr. George D. Parkinson, Mr. William A. Hilton, and Mr. P. T. Farnsworth, Jr., for the defendants.

Graniteville Manufacturing Company,
Appellant,
596 vs.
W. G. Query, J. P. Derham, et al., etc.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William R. Watkins in behalf of Mr. P. F. Henderson for the appellant.

—, Original.
Ex parte:
Will A. Jackson, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Crandall Mackey for the petitioner.

Seth M. Milliken, Gerrish H. Milliken, et al., Executors, etc., Petitioners,
87 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Chester A. Gwinn, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Edward H. Blanc and Russell L. Bradford, as amici curiae, in this cause.

—, Original.
Ex parte:
Frank Dial, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Dial, pro se.

The Denver and Salt Lake Railroad Company, Appellant,
567 vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Routt County;
The Denver and Salt Lake Railroad Company, Appellant,
568 vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Moffat County, Colorado.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elmer L. Brock for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Thomas M. Woodward for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

S. H. Bevins, Appellant,
574 vs.
State of Iowa.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald Evans for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. John Fletcher and Mr. Neill Garrett for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Edward Roos, Petitioner,
610 vs.
Texas Company of Mexico, S. A.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. B. Lewright and Mr. R. L. Batts for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. B. Ames and Mr. S. J. Brooks for the respondent.

Hubert Seabolt,

Petitioner,

611 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. M. Belcher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, Mr. A. E. Gottschall, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Anne Nichols,

Petitioner,

612 vs.

Univeraal Pictures Corporation, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Moses L. Malevinsky for the petitioner, and by Mr. Siegfried F. Hartman for the respondent.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

613 vs.

Joseph P. Kamer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson and Mr. C. S. Burg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jesse W. Barrett for the respondent.

Duke Power Company, Formerly Southern Power Company,

Petitioner,

617 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. H. Shelton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, Mr. C. M. Charest and Mr. Allin H. Pierce for the respondent.

Chili Fish, et al., Petitioners,
619 vs.
Walter Wise, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert L. Owen, Mr. Frank J. Boudinot, Mr. D. H. Linebaugh, and Mr. Henry G. Thomas for the petitioners, and by Mr. James A. Veasey and Mr. Lloyd G. Owen for the respondents.

Blakely D. McCaughn, formerly Collector, etc., Petitioner,
628 vs.
Zelia Gross Carnill, Executrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner.

United States Hoffman Machinery Corporation, Petitioner,
633 vs.
Pantex Pressing Machine, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Neave for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas G. Haight, Mr. J. Granville Meyers, Mr. Charles S. Jones, and Mr. T. J. Johnston for the respondent.

Tropic-Aire, Incorporated, Petitioner,
634 vs.
Sears, Roebuck & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. C. Paul and Mr. Maurice M. Moore for the petitioner, and by Mr. Otto Raymond Barnett for the respondent.

B. K. Isaacs, as Trustee, etc.,

72 vs.

Hobbs Tie & Timber Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. John R. Duty for Hobbs Tie & Timber Company, and concluded by Mr. William R. Watkins for Isaacs, Trustee.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company,
Appellant,

73 vs.

The United States of America, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Robert B. Tunstall for the appellants; continued by Mr. Nelson Thomas for the appellees, the United States and Interstate Commerce Commission; and by Mr. John H. Holt, for the appellees, Guyandot and Tug River R. R. Co., and Norfolk and Western Ry. Co.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilber M. Brucker, It is ordered that Kenneth M. Stevens, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilber M. Brucker, It is ordered that Paul Warren Voorhies, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Kerr, It is ordered that John F. Raper, Esquire, of Sheridan, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Howard W. Cavanagh, Esquire, of Battle Creek, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Willis G. Sears, It is ordered that Sam Seber, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Forrest M. Anderson, It is ordered that Raymond M. White, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Appellant,
73 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. John H. Holt for the appellees, Guyandot and Tug River R. R. Co. and Norfolk and Western Ry. Co., and concluded by Mr. Robert B. Tunstall for the appellant.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
74 vs.
Anthony LaFranca.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, and by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb, Jr., for the respondent.

Various Items of Personal Property, etc., et al., Petitioners,
114 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Lewis Landes for the petitioners, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.

Frank E. Furst and Fred C. Thomas, Partners, etc., Appellants,
76 vs.
James C. Brewster, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Frank F. Nesbit for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 28, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert N. Miller, It is ordered that Henry F. Tenney, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert N. Miller, It is ordered that George T. Rogers, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Aaron Youngquist, It is ordered that William C. Larson, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Brown Scott, It is ordered that Roy A. Fulcher, Esquire, of Clarendon, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Aaron Youngquist, It is ordered that Arthur Markve, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest W. Bradford, It is ordered that John A. Cosinach, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Frank E. Furst and Fred G. Thomas, partners, etc., Appellants,
76 vs.
James C. Brewster, et al.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Frank F. Nesbit for the appellants. No appearance for the appellees.

Hannah M. Smith, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
77 vs.
Magic City Kennel Club, Inc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur C. Brown for the respondent.

The United States, of America, Petitioner,
79 vs.
Theodore Michel;
The United States, of America, Petitioner,
80 vs.
Louis Krieger.

These cases were argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioners, and by Mr. Donald Horne for the respondents.

Henry Choteau, Petitioner,
81 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. T. J. Leahy for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., It is ordered that Milton R. Weinberger, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Henry Choteau,
Petitioner,
81 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. T. J. Leahy for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.

The State of Alabama,
Petitioner,
82 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, Jr., for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Thomas E. Knight, Jr., for the petitioner.

Seth M. Millikan, et al., Executors,
Petitioners,
87 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. D. A. Embury for the petitioners, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

The United States of America, et al.,
Appellants,
88 vs.
Atlanta, Birmingham & Coast Railroad Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Karl K. Gartner, It is ordered that Allen C. Gartner, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Weymouth Kirkland, It is ordered that Howard Ellis, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William V. Gregory, It is ordered that Calvin H. Lisman, Esquire, of Dixon, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America, et al.,
Appellants,
88 vs.
Atlanta, Birmingham & Coast Railroad Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the petitioners, and concluded by Mr. Robert C. Alston for the appellee.

J. M. Near,
Appellant,
91 vs.
The State of Minnesota, ex rel. Floyd B. Olson, County Attorney, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Weymouth Kirkland for the appellant, continued by Mr. James E. Markham and Mr. Arthur L. Markve for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Weymouth Kirkland for the appellant.

Harry F. Waite,
Petitioner,
103 vs.
The United States.

This case was submitted by Mr. O. Ellery Edwards for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Percy M. Cox, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, February 2 next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal.
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Kerr, It is ordered that Archie K. Shipe, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that Edward Sonnenschein, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Wilmeth, It is ordered that Fred H. Hasty, Esquire, of Charlotte, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert S. Regar, It is ordered that Harold A. Stewart, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Wilmeth, It is ordered that Basil M. Boyd, Esquire, of Charlotte, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that M. B. Silberberg, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Heartsill Ragon, It is ordered that Chas. W. Mehaffy, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that Paul N. McCloskey, Esquire, of San Bernardino, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Martin A. Morrison, It is ordered that Harry D. Michael, Esquire, of Crawfordsville, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Sloan, It is ordered that Fred G. Johnson, Esquire, of Hastings, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clyde D. Garrett, It is ordered that Sidney S. Bobbe, Esquire, of Larshmont, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacker, It is ordered that Homer Franklin Phillips, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Wilmeth, It is ordered that Jetter McKinley Scarborough, Esquire, of Charlotte, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Wallace Dempsey, It is ordered that Patrick J. Tierney, Esquire, of Plattsburgh, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry St. George Tucker, It is ordered that William Chapman Reverscomb, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Louisiana, Complainant,
8, Original. vs.
The State of Mississippi.

This cause came on for hearing on the pleadings, report of the Special Master, defendant's exceptions thereto, and was duly submitted.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that a decree be entered as recommended by the master, appointing a commission to locate the thread of the main channel of the Mississippi River as the same was immediately prior to the avulsion of 1912-13; and that the line when so located be decreed to be the boundary between the states, between latitude 32 degrees 39 seconds on the north and the division line between Issaquena and Warren Counties, Mississippi (as extended westward), on the south. The parties are accorded forty days within which to submit a decree in accordance with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The United States,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

56 vs. Court of Claims.

Swift and Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The United States of America, On writ of certiorari to the United

Petitioner, States Circuit Court of Appeals for

42 vs. the First Circuit.

Boston Buick Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The United States of America, On writ of certiorari to the United

Petitioner, States Circuit Court of Appeals for

43 vs. the First Circuit.

Iron Cap Copper Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The Pottstown Iron Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

113 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Louis H. Ensten and Lion Knitting Mills Company, Petitioners, On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for

46 vs. the Second Circuit.

Simon Ascher & Company, Incorporated.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Railway Express Agency, Inc., Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

55 vs.

The Commonwealth of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

—, Original.

Ex parte: Will A. Jackson, Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.

Ex parte: Charles A. Stutzman, Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.

Ex parte: Frank Dial, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Graniteville Manufacturing Company,
Appellant,
596 vs.
W. G. Query, J. P. Derham, et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, March 9 next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Florida, et al., Appellants,
16 vs.
The United States of America,
Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.;
Brooks-Scanlon Corporation, et al., Appellants,
17 vs.
The United States of America,
Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.;
Wilson Lumber Company of Florida, Appellant,
18 vs.
The United States of America,
Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

On consideration of the motions by the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company and Georgia Public Service Commission to stay the issuance of the mandates in these causes or that the Court so shape its mandates that the District Court may have authority to continue in effect the intrastate rates prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Denver and Salt Lake Railroad Company, Appellant,
567 vs.
The Board of County Commissioner of Routt County.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Denver and Salt Lake Railroad Company, Appellant,
568 vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Moffat County, Colorado.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Denver and Salt Lake Railroad Company, Appellant,
567 vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Routt County;
The Denver and Salt Lake Railroad Company, Appellant,
568 vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Moffat County, Colorado.

Appeals from the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

Treating the papers whereon the appeals in these causes were allowed as petitions for writs of certiorari, sec. 237 (c) Judicial Code, as amended, 43 Stat. 936, 938, consideration thereof is postponed, and leave is granted to petitioners to file briefs supporting applications for certiorari within 15 days, with 10 days for opposing counsel to reply. The Clerk shall cause the record to be printed and, on the first motion day after the expiration of the time granted to the parties for the filing of briefs, shall submit these cases to the Court for further consideration.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

S. H. Bevins,

Appellant,

574 vs.

State of Iowa.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward Roos,

Petitioner,

610 vs.

Texas Company of Mexico, S. A.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hubert Seabolt,

Petitioner,

611 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Anne Nichols,

Petitioner,

612 vs.

Universal Pictures Corporation, Carl Laemmle and Harry Pollard.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company, Petitioner,

613 vs.

Joseph P. Kamer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Duke Power Company, Formerly Southern Power Company, Petitioner,

617 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chili Fish, Allan Crain, Louis Fife, et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. Walter Wise, et al. 619

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arvey Moore, Petitioner, vs. Carter Oil Company. 562

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Hoffman Machinery Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Pantex Pressing Machine, Inc. 633

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Tropic-Aire, Incorporated,
Petitioner,
634 vs.
Sears, Roebuck & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ernest C. Marty, et al.,
Petitioners,
615 vs.
John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent to postpone the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause until February 24 next,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
16, Original. vs.
The State of New York and The City of New York.

The report of the special master in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles N. Burch.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The City of New York.

The motion for leave to file amended answer and to withdraw answer previously filed was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elliott S. Benedict for the defendant in support thereof, and by Mr. William A. Stevens and Mr. Duane B. Minard for the complainant in opposition thereto.

Bain Peanut Company of Texas, et al., Appellants,
49 vs.
Dave Pinson and C. B. Guyger.

On consideration of the motion by counsel for the appellants to stay the issuance of the mandate in this cause until the Court shall have disposed of appellants' petition for rehearing,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alfred Scott Aldridge, Petitioner,
683 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James F. Reilly for the petitioner.

Henry Fritzinger, Appellant,
590 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Fritzinger, pro se, in support thereof, and by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom and Mr. Russell O. Hanson for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Henry Fritzinger, Appellant,
591 vs.
The People of the State of Illinois, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Fritzinger, pro se, in support thereof, and by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom and Mr. Russell O. Hanson for the appellees in opposition thereto.

J. F. Johnson and John R. Mussen,
Petitioners,
614 vs.
The City of Los Angeles, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gurney E. Newlin for the petitioners, and by Mr. Erwin P. Werner and Mr. Frederick von Schrader for the respondents.

Walstein G. Smith, as Treasurer, etc.,
Petitioner,
616 vs.
Wood Freeman.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Rustgard for the petitioner, and by Mr. Martin J. Lund for the respondent.

Chasm Power Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
629 vs.
Village of Chateaugay.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Irvine for the petitioners, and by Mr. Patrick J. Tierney for the respondent.

DeForest Radio Company,
Petitioner,
630 vs.
General Electric Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., and Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ralph B. Evans, Mr. Hubert Howson, and Mr. Albert G. Davis for the respondent.

International Harvester Company,
Petitioner,
647 vs.
Mississippi Land Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Morgan, Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, Mr. Cleon Headley, Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, and Mr. John P. Wilson for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. E. Elmquist for the respondent.

The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey,
Petitioner,
652 vs.
Stella Hart.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Common Pleas, Hudson County, State of New Jersey, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Hershenstein for the respondent.

Gordon Oil Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
667 vs.
Cities Service Refining Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry G. Seligman for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Tuesday, February 24 next,

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
606 vs.
William H. Sprague and William J. Howey.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

B. K. Isaacs, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Henrietta E. Cunningham, Bankrupt,

72 vs.

Hobbs Tie & Timber Company.

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the certificate and transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Aaron Prussian, Petitioner,

448 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Oxford Paper Company, Petitioner, vs. Steamship "Nidarholm," A. S. Nidaros. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

58

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maine.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

J. W. Alford, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

370

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Richard Husty and Charles Laurel, Petitioners, vs. United States of America. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

477

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Saranac Automatic Machine Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Wirebounds Patents Company, et al. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

51

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, so far as it relates to the validity of patent No. 1,128,145; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan for further proceedings as to said patent in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Harold J. Coolidge and Augustus P. Loring, Trustees, Appellants,
33 vs.
Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations and Taxation of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Appeal from the Probate Court of Norfolk County, State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Probate Court of Norfolk County, State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Probate Court of Norfolk County, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Probate Court of Norfolk County, State of Massachusetts, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Roberts in which Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone concur.

Harold J. Coolidge and Augustus P. Loring, Trustees, Appellants,
34 vs.
Henry F. Long, Commissioner of Corporations and Taxation of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Appeal from the Probate Court of Norfolk County, State of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Probate Court of Norfolk County, State of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Probate Court of Norfolk County, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Probate Court of Norfolk County, State of Massachusetts, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Roberts in which Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone concur.

V. Loewers Gambrinus Brewery Company, Petitioner, vs. Charles W. Anderson, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue of the United States.

352 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Stone concurs in the result.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. National Industrial Alcohol Company, Inc.

109 — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Niagara Falls Brewing Company and Paul A. Schoellkopf, Charles E. Haeberle, et al., etc.

61 On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Theodore Michel.

79 On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
80 vs.
Louis Krieger.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The State of Connecticut,
Complainant,
12, Original. vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

O R D E R.

This cause having come for hearing on the exceptions of Connecticut to the Report of the Special Master and briefs of the parties, it is ordered that the bill of complaint be dismissed without prejudice to Connecticut's right to maintain a suit against Massachusetts whenever it shall appear that substantial interests of Connecticut are being injured through a material increase of the amount of the waters of the Ware and Swift rivers diverted by or under the authority of Massachusetts over and above the quantities authorized by the Acts of 1926 and 1927 as heretofore limited by the War Department. It is also ordered that each party pay its own costs, one-half of the expenses incurred by the Special Master and one-half of the amount to be fixed by the Court as his compensation.

It is further ordered that counsel for Massachusetts prepare a form of decree in consonance with the decision of this Court and furnish a copy to counsel for Connecticut within fifteen days; and that within ten days after such submission, the draft decree, together with suggestions in behalf of Connecticut, if any, be submitted to the Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Axel Langnes, Owner of the Diesel Halibut Vessel "Aloha," Her Engines, etc., Petitioner, vs. Winfield A. Green, Claimant. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

38

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Circuit Court of Appeals and the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, in this cause, be, and the same are hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Concordia Insurance Company of Milwaukee, Petitioner, vs. School District No. 98 of Payne County, State of Oklahoma. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

278

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Royal Insurance Company, Ltd.,

Petitioner,

279 vs.

School District No. 98 of Payne County, State of Oklahoma.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

National Fire Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

280 vs.

School District No. 98 of Payne County, State of Oklahoma.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Fire Association of Philadelphia,

Petitioner,

281 vs.

School District No. 98 of Payne County, State of Oklahoma.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Story Parchment Company,

Petitioner,

57 vs.

The Paterson Parchment Paper Company and Kalamazoo Vegetable Parchment Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Anthony LaFranca. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

74

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court, without prejudice to the further consideration and determination by the District Court of the question of liability in respect of the item of $4.68.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Various Items of Personal Property, etc.; The Waterloo Distilling Corporation, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

114

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Fullerton Lumber Company,

Petitioner,

47 vs.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission,

Appellants,

88 vs.

Atlanta, Birmingham & Coast Railroad Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Leslie T. Alward,

Petitioner,

41 vs.

C. G. Johnson, Treasurer of the State of California.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

U. G. Denman, Administrator of Charles H. Nauts, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

60 vs.

W. L. Slayton.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Bain Peanut Company of Texas and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Appellants, vs. Dave Pinson and G. B. Guyger. 49

Appeal from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eleventh Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

This cause came on for further consideration on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals for the Eleventh Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and on the petition for rehearing filed herein.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered that the order of this Court dismissing the appeal herein be, and the same is hereby, vacated, and that the judgment of the said Court of Civil Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the Courts of the State of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The State of Alabama, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 82

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims with direction to dismiss the petition for want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Harry F. Waite,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

103 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, so far as it relates to the question of interest; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Russian Volunteer Fleet,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

39 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank E. Furst and Fred G. Thomas, Partners, Doing Business Under the Firm Name of Furst & Thomas, Appellants,

76 vs.

James G. Brewster, Ed. A. Davis, and Henry M. Beaty.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Bruce L. Casteel, It is ordered that Samuel W. McCart, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Ledbetter, It is ordered that Francis Hartwell Fassett, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Farrar, It is ordered that Arthur W. Pettit, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Farrar, It is ordered that Arthur H. Geissler, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene C. Taylor, It is ordered that William H. Atkinson, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. McCarron, It is ordered that L. G. Pefferle, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Townsend, It is ordered that Thomas G. Goulden, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. B. Quinton, It is ordered that Richard Spencer, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry Randall Webb, It is ordered that Howard Somervell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that John L. Dorsey, Jr., Esquire, of Henderson, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that Fielding J. Pentecost, Esquire, of Henderson, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eliot C. Lovett, It is ordered that Paul Amundson, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Willis C. Sears, It is ordered that Jack Lee, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William B. Mathews, It is ordered that James S. Bennett, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Evans, It is ordered that John H. Pigg, Esquire, of London, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clark Burdick, It is ordered that Harry C. C. Koehne, Esquire, of Newport, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur R. Robinson, It is ordered that Oscar A. Ahlgren, Esquire, of Whiting, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur R. Robinson, It is ordered that Geo. . Compton, Esquire, of Columbia City, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert C. Simmons, It is ordered that Roscoe T. York, Esquire, of Scottsbluff, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that M. Vincent Carter, Esquire, of Kemmerer, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul D. Miller, It is ordered that David E. Lilienthal, Esquire of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that James Fred Upchurch, Esquire, of Corsicana, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George C. Thorpe, It is ordered that Floyd E. Huntley, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company,
Illinois Central Railroad Company, The
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company,
et al., etc., Appellants,
333 vs.
United States of America, Interstate
Commerce Commission, and J. W. Cammack,
Attorney General of the State of Kentucky.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Sutherland.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company,
and Texarkana and Fort Smith Railway
Company, Appellants,
517 vs.
The United States of America and
Interstate Commerce Commission.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Abie State Bank,

Appellant,

63 vs.

Charles W. Bryan, as Governor of the State of Nebraska; Clarence G. Bliss, as Secretary of the Department of Trade and Commerce; T. W. Bass, as Treasurer, etc., et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hannah M. Smith, Administratrix of the Estate of Owen P. Smith, Deceased,

Petitioner,

77 vs.

Magic City Kennel Club, Inc., and John J. Shaughnessy.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of New Jersey,

Complainant,

16, Original. vs.

The State of New York and the City of New York.

O R D E R.

The report of the Special Master is received and ordered to be filed. Exceptions by the parties, if any, shall be filed on or before Monday, March 16th next, and the case is assigned for hearing on such exceptions, if any, on Monday, April 13th next. Briefs in support of any exceptions are to be filed two weeks before the date fixed for hearing. Reply briefs, if any, are to be filed one week before such hearing.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of New Jersey,

Complainant,

17, Original. vs.

The City of New York.

O R D E R.

The motion of the defendant for leave to file an amended answer and to withdraw the answer heretofore filed in this cause, is granted;

Provided, that the complainant's reply to the original answer may, if desired, be deemed the reply to the amended answer and that all proceedings heretofore taken herein shall stand and shall be regarded as having been taken as if the amended answer had been originally filed, and without reopening the evidence.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alfred Scott Aldridge,

Petitioner,

683 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. The case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, March 16th next, at the head of the call for that day. The record shall be printed at public expense (Act June 27, 1922, 42 Stat. 666; U. S. C. Title 28, Sec. 832), and the Clerk shall cause the petition and the briefs for the petitioner to be printed and shall pay the expense thereof, together with the costs in the case in the manner provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alfred Scott Aldridge,

Petitioner,

683 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted, limited to the question raised by the exceptions to the ruling of the trial court on the examination on voir dire of prospective jurors.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry Fritzinger,

Appellant,

590 vs.

The People of the State of Illinois, Frank LeRoy Lawson, Jacob Koren, and Margaret Lawson.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry Fritzinger,

Appellant,

590 vs. Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

The People of the State of Illinois, State of Illinois.

Frank LeRoy Lawson, et al.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry Fritzinger,

Appellant,

591 vs. Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

The People of the State of Illinois, State of Illinois.

Samuel Wade, Fred Farischon and

Louis M. Friedrich.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry Fritzinger,

Appellant,

591 vs. Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

The People of the State of Illinois, State of Illinois.

Samuel Wade, et al.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

DeForest Radio Company,
Petitioner,
630 vs.
General Electric Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. F. Johnson and John R. Mussen,
Petitioners,
614 vs.
The City of Los Angeles, a municipal corporation, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Walstein G. Smith, as Treasurer of the Territory of Alaska,
Petitioner,
616 vs.
Wood Freeman.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chasm Power Company, Plattsburgh Gas and Electric Company and Eastern New York Electric and Gas Company, Inc., Petitioners,

629 vs.

Village of Chateaugay.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

International Harvester Company, Petitioner,

647 vs.

Mississippi Land Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey, Petitioner,

652 vs.

Stella Hart.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Common Pleas, Hudson County, State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Common Pleas, Hudson County, State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gordon Oil Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
667 vs.
Cities Service Refining Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States,
Complainant,
7, Original. vs.
The State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the complainant to dismiss the bill of complaint with prejudice,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the bill of complaint in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ernest C. Marty, et al.,
Petitioners,
615 vs.
John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration, etc.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent to defer the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause until March 9th,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Merchants Warehouse Company, Appellant,

635 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

Merchants Warehouse Company, et al., Appellants,

636 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,

637 vs.

Merchants Warehouse Company, et al.;

The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, Appellant,

638 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, et al., Appellants,

639 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,

340 vs.

The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, et al.;

The Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, Appellant,

641 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al., Appellants,

642 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,

643 vs.

The Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, in that behalf.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 745 vs. William L. Nevin, Executor, etc.	The motion to advance this case to be heard following case No. 252, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner.
Harry F. Waite, Petitioner, 103 vs. The United States.	On consideration of the motion of counsel for the petitioner to have the mandate in this cause issued forthwith, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the mandate in this cause issue forthwith. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
The First National Bank of Chicago, a National Banking Association, Petitioner, 124 vs. The United States.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. John E. McClure, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Bank of Commerce & Trust Company, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
North Bend Stage Line, Inc., Appellant, 134 vs. John C. Denney, Director, C. Rea Moore, Supervisor of Public Utilities, et al.	The motion for leave to file brief of Stephen V. Carey, as amicus curiae, in this cause, was submitted by Mr. James F. Reilly, in that behalf, and the motion was denied.
The United States of America ex relatione Ethel M. McLennan, Petitioner, 618 vs. Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. William H. King, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Utah, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

The United States of America ex relatione Ethel M. McLennan, Petitioner,
618 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Montana, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

The United States of America ex relatione Ethel M. McLennan, Petitioner,
618 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. William R. Eaton, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Colorado, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

The United States of America ex relatione Ethel M. McLennan, Petitioner,
618 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. M. Vincent Carter, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Wyoming, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

The United States of America ex relatione Ethel M. McLennan, Petitioner,
618 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Peter Q. Nyce, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the State of New Mexico, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
535 vs.
Northern Trust Company, Executor, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. John E. Hughes, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Jennie L. Hodgkins, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Group No. 1, Oil Corporation, Petitioner, 425 vs. James W. Bass, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. James F. Upchurch, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Texas, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
— Original. Ex parte: Frank J. Vital, Petitioner.	The motion for leave to file petition for writ of habeas corpus and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Vitale pro se.
—, Original. Ex parte: Jehudah Benjamin, Petitioner.	The motion for leave to file petition for writ of habeas corpus and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jehudah Benjamin pro se.
—, Original. Ex parte: Frank Dial, Petitioner.	The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Dial pro se.
William W. Whitson, as Substituted Administrator, etc., Petitioner, 740 vs. The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company.	The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. Sheean for the petitioner.
Amanda D. Hargis, Commissioner of Labor, etc., Appellant, 217 vs. A. T. Bradford.	The return of appellant to the rule to show cause herein was presented.

Paysoff Tinkoff, Petitioner, 727 vs. Andrew W. Mellon, individually, etc.	The motion for stay was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Bennett and Mr. Paysoff Tinkoff for the petitioner.
Yetta Stromberg, Appellant, 584 vs. The People of the State of California.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Beardsley for the appellant.
Graniteville Manufacturing Company, Appellant, 596 vs. W. G. Query, J. P. Derham, et al., etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. F. Henderson for the appellant.
A. Spates Brady, Appellant, 632 vs. The United States of America, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George T. Bell for the appellant.

The United States of America ex relatione Ethel M. McLennan, Petitioner,
618 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior;
The United States of America ex rel. H. H. Simpson, Petitioner,
676 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, et al.;
The United States of America ex rel. Roy G. Barton, Petitioner,
704 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Department of the Interior;
The United States of America ex rel. W. B. Pyron, Petitioner,
743 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis Edwin Hoffman and Mr. Chester I. Long for the petitioner in No. 618; by Mr. Homer R. Hendricks and Mr. Donald V. Hunter for the petitioner in No. 676; by Mr. James Conlon for the petitioner in No. 704; by Mr. John W. Fisher for the petitioner in No. 743; and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Aubrey Lawrence, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Antone Parmagini, Petitioner,
620 vs.
The United States of America;
William Levin, Petitioner,
660 vs.
The United States of America.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Titus and Mr. Otto Christensen for the petitioner in No. 620; by Mr. Robert B. McMillan for the petitioner in No. 660; and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
626 vs.
Harry Rachmil.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. William H. Ramsey, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner.

Joe Snider, Louis Snider, et al.,
Petitioners,
631 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Walter Cocke for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Ralph F. Bell, et al.,
Petitioners,
645 vs.
The United States Steel Products Company;
California Packing Corporation,
Petitioner,
654 vs.
The United States Steel Products Company.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark and Mr. Ralph W. Brown for the petitioners in No. 645; by Mr. Leonard J. Matteson and Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the petitioner in No. 654; and by Mr. Charles S. Haight, Mr. Kenneth B. Halstead, and Mr. John W. Griffin for the respondent.

Ida M. Blankenburg,
Petitioner,
646 vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Judicial Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, County of Suffolk, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Asa P. French for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph E. Warner for the respondent.

John H. Vinson, Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
648 vs.
O. H. Graham, T. D. Harris, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long, Mr. W. E. Stanley, Mr. Peter Q. Nyce, Mr. Austin M. Cowan, Mr. Malcolm W. Nesser, and Mr. Thos. H. Owen for the petitioners, and by Mr. John M. Brennan and Mr. Elmer J. Lundy for the respondents.

Marion E. Yelland, Petitioner,
650 vs.
The Bankers Reserve Life Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel B. Bassett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Geo. B. Thatcher, Mr. Wm. Woodburn, and Mr. Thomas F. Ryan, for the respondent.

St. Louis Merchants Bridge Terminal Railroad, Petitioner,
651 vs.
Hugh Doyle, as Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roy W. Rucker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Jesse W. Barrett for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
653 vs.
W. F. Taylor, United Fishermen's Packing Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, and Mr. Nat. M. Lucy for the petitioner.

Henry Luxenberg, Petitioner, 655 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nelson T. Hartson, Mr. Frank J. Hogan, and Mr. Sam T. Spears for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.
Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway Company, Petitioner, 657 vs. Celia Cross, Administratrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Carey, Mr. Charles A. Hart, and Mr. Charles E. McCulloch for the petitioner.
O. H. Ingram Company, Petitioner, 658 vs. Wisconsin Tax Commission, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. M. Beach for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Reynolds for the respondents.
Macon, Dublin & Savannah Railroad Company, Petitioner, 659 vs. General Redution Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Akerman for the petitioner, and by Mr. George S. Jones for the respondent.

James Richardson & Sons, Ltd., et al., Petitioners,
661 vs.
The Jenkins Steamship Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Greenfield for the petitioners, and by Mr. Sherwin A. Hill and Mr. Thomas H. Garry for the respondents.

The Permutit Company, Petitioner,
663 vs.
Graver Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Drury W. Cooper, Mr. Graham Sumner, and Mr. George A. Chritton for the petitioner, and by Mr. George L. Wilkinson and Mr. Charles L. Byron for the respondent.

Dashiell Motor Company, Petitioner,
666 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Pegler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The Delaware and Hudson Company, Petitioner,
668 vs.
William T. Dunnigan.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Rosch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter A. Fullerton for the respondent.

Frank Stranahan,
Petitioner,
669 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas O. Marlar and Mr. E. J. Marshall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John H. McEvers for the respondent.

Howard C. Long, Leo J. Steinbach, et al.,
Petitioners,
670 vs.
Dr. Irvin D. Metzger, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Andrew G. Smith for the petitioners, and by Mr. Wm. A. Schnader and Mr. Penrose Hertzler for the respondents.

Oklahoma-Arkansas Telephone Company,
Petitioner,
672 vs.
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James B. McDonough, Mr. Joseph W. House, Mr. James B. McDonough, Jr., and Mr. Joseph R. Brown for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward B. Downie, Mr. Claude Nowlin, and Mr. Joseph W. Jamison for the respondent.

L. M. Crawford,
Petitioner,
673 vs.
Z. T. White, Maude E. White, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 8th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thornton Hardie for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. W. Turney, Mr. A. H. Culwell, and Mr. Wm. H. Burges for the respondents.

R. C. L. Moncure, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,

674 vs.

Atlantic Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Hayner H. Larson, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Andrew D. Christian for the respondent.

C. Franklin Davis, Voluntary Agent, etc., Petitioner,

677 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bynum E. Hinton for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. S. Dee Hanson, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Smoot Sand and Gravel Corporation, Petitioner,

678 vs.

Washington Airport, Incorporated.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas D. Thacher and Mr. Seth W. Richardson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Titus for the respondent.

Pacific Southwest Trust & Savings Bank, Petitioner,

679 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank H. McCulloch and Mr. Hugh W. McCulloch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Drew Savoy for the respondent.

Michael Lisena,
Petitioner,
680 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank B. Bozza for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Ralph S. Lyney,
Petitioner,
681 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elvin Swarthout for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Olin R. Holt,
Petitioner,
682 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Wattawa for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Lucille Kilmer and James P. Morison, an Infant, etc.,
Petitioners,
684 vs.
Norfolk & Western Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry K. Byrer for the petitioners, and by Mr. F. M. Rivinus for the respondent.

Cora Adams and James M. Hays, Petitioners, 694 vs. Annetta Hoskins, Bertie De Steiguer, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Hays and Mr. John T. Hays for the petitioners, and by Mr. Almond D. Cochran, Mr. Edgar T. Noble, and Mr. Robert B. F. Hummer for the respondents.
The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, 701 vs. A. Sanford.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Moore, Mr. James B. McDonough, Mr. A. F. Smith, and Mr. Samuel W. Moore for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondent.
The Employers' Liability Assurance Corporation, Limited, etc., Petitioner, 706 vs. Mrs. Callie L. Dean.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Shepard Bryan for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Slaton for the respondent.
Walter C. Fetters, United States Marshal, etc., Petitioner, 720 vs. The United States of America ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the petitioner, and by Mr. Benjamin M. Golder and Mr. Ruby R. Vale for the respondent.

Gynther Storaasli,

Appellant,

393 vs.

The State of Minnesota.

This case was submitted by Mr. Charles Bunn and Mr. Pierce Butler, Jr., for the appellant, and by Mr. Henry N. Benson and Mr. James E. Markham for the appellee.

The United States of America,

Complainant,

14, Original. vs.

The State of Utah.

Four hours were allowed for the argument of this case. The argument on the exceptions to the report of the Special Master was commenced by Mr. Charles M. Blackmar for the complainant, and continued by Mr. P. T. Farnsworth, Jr., for the defendant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,

Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson J. Jewett, It is ordered that Albert L. Jacobs, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson J. Jewett, It is ordered that Simon Bruder, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson J. Jewett, It is ordered that M. E. Jones, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William F. Kelly, It is ordered that Phidias J. J. Nicolaides, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William F. Kelly, It is ordered that Nathaniel Elmer Wheeler, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isaac E. Ferguson, It is ordered that Geo. G. Perrin, Esquire, of Rock Island, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Evans, It is ordered that Abner R. Neff, Esquire, of Long Beach, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Gordon Edwards, It is ordered that Chas. Beach Edwards, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth McKellar, It is ordered that Thomas Crutchfield, Esquire, of Chattanooga, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Caesar L. Aiello, It is ordered that Benj. F. Wegler, Esquire, of Wichita, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Northern Trust Company, Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Ellen L. Van Schaick.	On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Raymond M. White, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
535	
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Northern Trust Company, Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Ellen L. Van Schaick.	On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Thomas M. Lynch and others as amici curiae, in this cause, on motion of Mr. Seth T. Cole.
535	
The United States, Complainant, vs. The State of Utah.	The argument on the exceptions to the report of the Special Master was continued by Mr. P. T. Farnsworth, Jr., for the defendant, and concluded by Mr. Charles M. Blackmar for the complainant.
14, Original.	
Group No. 1 Oil Corporation, Petitioner, vs. James W. Bass, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Homer L. Bruce for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. James A. Baker for the petitioner.
425	
William W. McBoyle, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Harry F. Brown for the petitioner.
552	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard K. Stevens, It is ordered that Melvin W. Sandmeyer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that Gordon Browning, Esquire, of Huntingdon, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, It is ordered that William Wright Moore, Jr., Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Dickinson Letts, It is ordered that William Alvin Pittenger, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold G. Manning, It is ordered that Arthur W. Nelson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counseller of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Martin A. Leach,
Appellant,
686 vs.
The People of the State of California.

The motion to suspend the operation of Rule 12 pending action on motion to dismiss was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse I. Miller for the appellant.

William W. McBoyle,
Petitioner,
552 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Harry F. Brown for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

John William McKissick, et al.,
Appellants,
316 vs.
Adolphus R. Talbot, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Leslie C. Pefferle for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Etta M. Klein, former administrator of the estate of Solomon Klein, deceased, et al., etc., Petitioners,
387 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Benjamin B. Pettus for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. H. H. Shinnick for the petitioners.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
535 vs.
Northern Trust Company, Executor, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Walter E. Hope for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward H. Blanc for the respondent.

Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., Administrator, etc., Petitioner, 581 vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	This case was argued by Mr. Edward H. Blanc for the petitioner, and the case was submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Walter E. Hope, Mr. C. M. Charest, Mr. Wm. T. Sabine, Jr., and Mr. Prew Savoy for the respondent.
Cyrus M. McCormick, et al., Executors, etc., Petitioners, 542 vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	This case was argued by Mr. George T. Rogers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.
Director of the Lands of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner, 64 vs. Pedro Villa-Abrille, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William Cattron Rigby for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. A. Smith, It is ordered that Aneita P. B. Keating, ~~Esquire~~, of East Orange, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. A. Smith, It is ordered that M. Francis Keating, Esquire, of East Orange, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. P. Gore, It is ordered that Charles Warren Conner, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Cable, It is ordered that Clyde L. Deeds, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy C. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Paul J. Mortman, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Mason Welch, It is ordered that Milton T. Broome, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Louis I. Werbner, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vernon E. Hodges, It is ordered that J. Preston Swecker, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Charles Scott Kelly, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Robert O.Sullivan, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Seth M. Milliken, Gerrish H. Milliken,
and Harold A. Hatch, Executors of the
Estate of Seth M. Milliken, Deceased, Petitioners, vs. The United States. — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

87

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

American Fruit Growers, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Brogdex Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

48

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

—, Original. On consideration of the motion for leave
Ex parte: Frank J. Vitale, Petitioner. to file a petition for writ of habeas corpus and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original. On consideration of the motion for
Ex parte: Jehudah Benjamin, Petitioner, leave to file a petition for writ of habeas corpus and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original. On consideration of the motion for leave
Ex parte: Frank Dial, Petitioner. to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William W. Whitson, as Substituted Administrator of the Estate of George Noon, Deceased, Petitioner,
740 vs.
The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William W. Whitson, as Substituted Administrator of the Estate of George Noon, Deceased, Petitioner,
740 vs.
The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Amanda D. Hargis, Commissioner of Labor and Industrial Inspection of the State of Missouri, Appellant,
217 vs.
A. T. Bradford.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri.

This cause came on for consideration on the return of the appellant to the rule issued to show cause why the interlocutory decree of the specially constituted District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, entered March 15, 1930, should not be vacated and the cause remanded to that court with directions to dismiss the case as moot.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the interlocutory decree of the said District Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, vacated, without costs to either party; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri with directions to dismiss the case as moot.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Merchants Warehouse Company, Appellant,
635 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
Merchants Warehouse Company, et al., Appellants,
636 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
637 vs.
Merchants Warehouse Company, et al.;
The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Co., Appellant,
638 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Co., et al., Appellants,
639 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
640 vs.
The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, et al.;
The Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Co., Appellant,
641 vs.

Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al., Appellants,

642 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,

643 vs.

The Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases are advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, April 13 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Paysoff Tinkoff, Petitioner,

727 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Individually, etc.

On consideration of the motion for an order staying the enforcement and execution of the order of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia pending the decision of this Court on the petition for certiorari filed in the above entitled cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Martin A. Leach, Appellant,

686 vs.

The People of the State of California.

Appeal from the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District of the State of California.

On motion of the appellant, and pursuant to a stipulation of the parties, it is ordered that the time within which the parties shall comply with the provisions of Rule 12 of this Court be, and the same is hereby, extended for a period of thirty days from this date;

Provided, however, that if a motion by the appellee to dismiss the appeal herein for the want of jurisdiction is filed within such thirty day period, time for compliance with Rule 12 shall be extended until the disposition of that motion, or until two weeks after such disposition, should such motion be denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Yetta Stromberg,

Appellant,

584 vs.

The People of the State of California.

ORDER.

Probable jurisdiction of this appeal is noted, and the cause is advanced and assigned for hearing on Monday, April 13th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day. The motion for leave to proceed further herein in forma pauperis is granted; the record shall be printed at public expense (Act June 27, 1922, 42 Stat. 666; U. S. C., Title 28, Sec. 832); and the Clerk shall cause the briefs for the appellant to be printed and shall pay the expense thereof, together with the costs in the case in the manner provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Graniteville Manufacturing Company,

Appellant,

596 vs.

W. G. Query, J. P. Derham, et al.

In this cause probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. Spates Brady,

Appellant,

632 vs.

The United States of America, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John William McKissick and D. W. Wright,

Appellants,

316 vs.

Adolphus R. Talbot, Joseph G. Ray, and Edgar J. Bullard, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

535 vs.

Northern Trust Company, Executor of
the Last Will and Testament of
Ellen L. Van Schaick.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edgar M. Morsman, Jr., Administrator
of the Estate of Edgar M. Morsman,

Petitioner,

581 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cyrus H. McCormick, Anita McCormick Blaine, and Harold F. McCormick, Executors of the Last Will and Testament of Mettie Fowler McCormick, Deceased, Petitioners, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

542

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Ex Relatione Ethel M. McLennan, Petitioner, vs. Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

618

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America, ex rel.
H. H. Simpson,
Petitioner,
676 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America, ex rel.
Roy G. Barton,
Petitioner,
704 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America, ex rel.
W. B. Pyron,
Petitioner,
743 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior and C. C. Moore, Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Permutit Company,
Petitioner,
663 vs.
Graver Corporation.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Smoot Sand and Gravel Corporation,
Petitioner,
678 vs.
Washington Airport, Incorporated.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Walter C. Fetters, United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania,
Petitioner,
720 vs.
United States of America, ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Antone Parmagini, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 620

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Levin, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 660

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certi rari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Harry Rachmil. 626

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joe Snider, Louis Snider and
Leopold Jantz,
Petitioners,
631 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitionbe, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ralph F. Bell, et al.,
Petitioners,
645 vs.
United States Steel Products Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitionbe, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

California Packing Corporation,
Petitioner,
654 vs.
United States Steel Products Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitionbe, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ida M. Blankenburg, Petitioner, vs. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts. 646

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Judicial Court, County of Suffolk, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Judicial Court, County of Suffolk, State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John H. Vinson, Administrator with the will annexed of the Estate of Dorsey Fife, Deceased, et al., Petitioners, vs. O. H. Graham, T. D. Harris, Wirlick & Company, et al. 648

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Marion E. Yelland, Petitioner, vs. The Bankers Reserve Life Company. 650

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitionbe, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

St. Louis Merchants Bridge Terminal Railroad, Petitioner, vs. Hugh Doyle, as Administrator of the Estate of Peter Doyle, Deceased. 651

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petitionbe, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. W. F. Taylor, United Fishermen's Packing Company, a Corporation, et al. 653

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry Luxenberg, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 655

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Spokane, Portland and Seattle
Railway Company,

Petitioner,

657 vs.

Celia Cross, Administratrix of the Estate of Frank W. Cross, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

O. H. Ingram Company,

Petitioner,

658 vs.

Wisconsin Tax Commission, W. J. Conway, Pearce Tomkins, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Macon, Dublin & Savannah Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

659 vs.

General Reduction Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James Richardson & Sons, Ltd., and
Donahue-Stratton Company, etc.,
Petitioners,
661 vs.
The Jenkins Steamship Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dashiell Motor Company,
Petitioner,
666 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Delaware and Hudson Company,
Petitioner,
668 vs.
William T. Dunnigan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank Stranahan, Petitioner,
669 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Howard C. Long, Leo J. Steinbach, Blanche R. Young, et al., Petitioners,
670 vs.
Dr. Irvin D. Metzger, Dr. William M. Hillegas, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Oklahoma-Arkansas Telephone Company, Petitioner,
672 vs.
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

L. M. Crawford,

Petitioner,

673 vs.

Z. T. White, Maude B. White, James G. McMary, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, 8th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 8th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

R. C. L. Moncure, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue for the United States at Richmond, Virginia,

Petitioner,

674 vs.

Atlantic Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. Franklin Davis, Voluntary Agent for Persons Acting Under the Name of Ford Car Owners Protective Association,

Petitioner,

677 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Michael Lisena,

Petitioner,

680 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ralph S. Hyney,

Petitioner,

681 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Olin R. Holt,

Petitioner,

682 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lucille Kilmer and James P. Morison, an Infant, by his next friend, Petitioners,
684 vs.
Norfolk & Western Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cora Adams and James M. Hays, Petitioners,
694 vs.
Annetta Hoskins, Bertie De Steiguer, C. L. McMahon and Independent Oil & Gas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
701 vs.
A. Sanford.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Employer's Liability Assurance Corporation, Limited of London, England, Petitioner, vs. Mrs. Callie L. Dean.

706

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Georgia, Petitioner, vs. John W. Grant.

205

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Georgia, Petitioner, vs. John W. Grant and Annie Inman Grant.

206

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Wyoming, Complainant, 20, Original. vs. The State of Colorado.	On consideration of the motion to extend the return day in this cause to April 6 next, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
Spencer Aldrich and Bankers Trust Company, as Trustee, etc., et al., Appellants, 607 vs. The City of New York, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Anthony J. Ernest for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly, Mr. Frank Nevins, Mr. Asa B. Kellogg, and Mr. Harvey D. Jacob for the appellee, in opposition thereto.
The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, Appellant, 622 vs. Carroll County and J. T. Hester, Trustee, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Joseph W. Byrns for the appellee, in opposition thereto.
The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, Appellant, 623 vs. Benton County, Tennessee, and J. C. Herrin, Trustee, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the appellant.

The Philadelphia Electric Company,
Appellant,
625 vs.
The City of Philadelphia.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis B. Bracken for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. G. Coe Farrier, Mr. Ernest Lowengrund, and Mr. Augustus Trast Ashton for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Merchants Warehouse Company, Appellant,
635 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
Merchants Warehouse Company, et al., Appellants,
636 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, Appellant,
638 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, et al., Appellants,
639 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
The Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, Appellant,
641 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al., Appellants,
642 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. Hampton Todd, Mr. John P. Connelly, Mr. M. Edgar Barnes, and Mr. Allen S. Olmstead, 2d, for the appellant.

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
637 vs.
Merchants Warehouse Company, et al.;
The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
640 vs.
The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, et al.;
The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
643 vs.
The Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Elmer B. Collins, Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton, Mr. J. Stanley Payne, and Mr. John J. Hickey for the appellants.

George T. Mitchell, Attorney General of the State of Mississippi, et al., etc., Appellants,
671 vs.
Penny Stores, Inc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. A. Lauderdale for the appellants.

The Denver and Salt Lake Railroad Company, Petitioner,
567 vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Routt County;
The Denver and Salt Lake Railroad Company, Petitioner,
568 vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Moffat County, Colorado.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elmer L. Brock for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas M. Woodward for the respondents.

Charles H. Randall, Hector Randall, et al., etc., Petitioners,
627 vs.
The United States of America.

Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General John E. Hoover for the respondent.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. Walton Hendry for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr.

Cumberland Coal Company, Petitioner,
687 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments in Greene County, Pennsylvania;
Cumberland Coal Company, Petitioner,
688 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments in Greene County, Pennsylvania;
Cumberland Coal Company, Petitioner,
689 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments in Greene County, Pennsylvania;
Cumberland Coal Company, Petitioner,
690 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments in Greene County, Pennsylvania;
Henry A. Phillips, Petitioner,
691 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments in Greene County, Pennsylvania;
Piedmont Coal Company, Petitioner,
692 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments in Greene County, Pennsylvania;
Greene County Coal Company, Petitioner,
693 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Seifert, Mr. Samuel McClay, Mr. W. J. Kyle, and Mr. Carl E. Glock for the petitioner.

Field and Start, Inc., Petitioner, 697 vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry T. Dorrance and Mr. J. G. Korner, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. H. Conner, Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Dewitt M. Evans for the respondent.
Louise McGrew Moffett, et al., etc., Petitioners, 700 vs. Helen Moffett, Jennie M. Lynn, et al., etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin J. O'Donnell for the petitioners, and by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Russell L. Hazzard for the respondents.
United States of America ex rel. Vahan Cardashian, Petitioner, 702 vs. Edgar C. Snyder, United States Marshal, etc., et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph C. Fehr and Mr. Marion DeVries for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.
Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner, 707 vs. E. H. D'Avignon.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James F. Wright and Mr. W. W. Dykes for the petitioner, and by Mr. John S. Barbour for the respondent.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
708 vs.
Perry A. Shindledecker.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. D. McKenney, Mr. John Spalding Flannery, Mr. George Bowdoin Craighill, and Mr. Harold W. Fraser for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ralph D. Cole for the respondent.

Willis T. Gridley and Gladys Wright,
Petitioners,
710 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Dunham and Mr. W. D. Jamieson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Harvey M. Toy and Mabelle B. Lucas,
Petitioners,
716 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carey Van Fleet for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, Miss Helen R. Carloss, and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

E. F. Bandler,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
Mayers, Osterwald & Muhlfeld, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marion DeVries, Mr. Jesse P. Crawford, and Mr. H. Kennedy McCook for the petitioner, and by Mr. Addison S. Pratt for the respondent.

The Sixty-Seven South Munn, Inc., Petitioner,
719 vs.
Board of Public Utility Commissioners of New Jersey, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Merrit Lane for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Speer for the respondents.

The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner,
733 vs.
Boyd E. Chambers;
The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner,
734 vs.
E. L. Fitzgerald;
The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner,
735 vs.
W. O. Hylton.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John R. Pendleton and Mr. W. H. T. Loyall for the petitioner.

C. E. Herron,
131 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

This case was submitted by Mr. P. H. Hayes for Herron and by Mr. Charles H. Bates for Southern Pacific Company.

The Director of the Lands of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner,
64 vs.
Pedro Villa-Abrille, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. William Cattron Rigby for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. Mason Welch for the respondents. The court declined to hear further argument.

The Director of the Lands of the Philippine Islands, Petitioner, 64 vs. Pedro Villa-Abrille, Eugenia Villa-Abrille, Luz Villa-Abrille, et al.	On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the writ of certiorari, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner, 85 vs. Munson Steamship Line.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the petitioner, continued by Mr. W. Calvin Chestnut for the respondent. The Court declined to hear further argument.
Demetrius Philippidos, Petitioner, 92 vs. Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of New York.	This case was argued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent and the case was submitted by Mr. Thomas A. Kane and Mr. George C. Vournas for the petitioner.
Walter E. Carr, Director of Immigration, etc., Petitioner, 125 vs. Mateo Zaja.	This case was argued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner and by Mr. Erwin I. Feldman for the respondent.
United States of America ex rel. Costas Cateches, Petitioner, 336 vs. Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration.	This case was argued by Mr. Harold Van Riper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
93 vs.
Frank Collis Bowers, Executor, etc.;
Frank Collis Bowers, Executor, etc.,
Petitioner,
160 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. James H. McIntosh for the petitioner in No. 93 and respondent in No. 160.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Littleton M. Wickham, It is ordered that Percy Summerell Stephenson, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ayres, It is ordered that J. Howard Wilcox, Esquire, of Anthony, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard F. Bresee, It is ordered that James Dempsey, Esquire, of Peekskill, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. J. Montague, It is ordered that Meade T. Spicer, Jr., Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy C. Fitzgerald, It is ordered that Thomas M. Ford, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hance H. Cleland, It is ordered that John C. Murspool, Esquire, of Olympia, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl C. Bachmann, It is ordered that Newell Kirkwood Kennon, Esquire, of St. Clairsville, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John H. Vinson, Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
648 vs.
O. H. Graham, et al.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the petitioners to stay the issuance of the order denying the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause for a period of 10 days from this date,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,
93 vs.
Frank Collis Bowers, Executor, etc.;

Frank Collis Bowers, Executor, etc., Petitioner,
160 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent in No. 93 and petitioner in No. 160, and concluded by Mr. James H. McIntosh for the petitioner in No. 93 and respondent in No. 160.

The United States, Petitioner, 116 vs. Felt & Tarrant Mfg. Company.	This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the respondent.
Joseph B. Stratton, et al., etc. 137 vs. Andy New, Jr., Trustee, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Randolph Bias for Stratton, et al., and by Mr. Arthur F. Kingdon for New, Trustee.
Gene Buck, as President, etc., et al., 138 vs. Jewell-Lasalle Realty Company; Gene Buck, as President, etc., et al., 139 vs. Jewell-Lasalle Realty Company; Jewell-Lasalle Realty Company, 140 vs. Gene Buck, as President, etc.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Thomas G. Haight for Buck, etc., et al., and continued by Mr. Charles M. Blackmar for Jewell-Lasalle Realty Company.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas F. Cameron, It is ordered that Walter L. O'Rourke, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter B. Gibbons, It is ordered that Louis J. Bergson, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Price, It is ordered that Rolland M. Edmonds, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Dallinger, It is ordered that Joseph J. Launie, Esquire, of Medford, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry H. Hornbrook, It is ordered that Victor E. Funk, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton L. French, It is ordered that Ezra R. Whitla, Esquire, of Coeur D'Alene, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Aaron Youngquist, It is ordered that Chas. A. Swenson, Esquire, of Atwater, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry H. Hornbrook, It is ordered that John W. Hutchinson, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry H. Hornbrook, It is ordered that George W. Rufsmith, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Aaron Youngquist, It is ordered that Thomas E. DeWolfe, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Gene Buck, as President, etc., et al., 138 vs. Jewell-LaSalle Realty Company; Gene Buck, as President, etc., et al., 139 vs. Jewell-LaSalle Realty Company; Jewell-LaSalle Realty Company, 140 vs. Gene Buck, as President, etc., et al.	The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Charles M. Blackmar for Jewell-LaSalle Realty Company, and concluded by Mr. Thomas G. Haight for Buck, etc., et al.
Chesapeake and Ohio Ry. Co., Petitioner, 155 vs. M. E. Martin, et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Meade T. Spicer, Jr., for the petitioner. No appearance for the respondent.
State-Planters Bank & Trust Co., et al. 166 vs. T. Nelson Parker, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Percy S. Stephenson for State-Planters Bank & Trust Co., et al., continued by Mr. John W. Oast, Jr., for Parker, et al., and concluded by Mr. Littleton M. Wickham for State-Planters Bank & Trust Company, et al.
The First National Bank of Chicago, etc., Petitioner, 124 vs. The United States.	This case was argued by Mr. Harold V. Amberg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.
North Bend Stage Line, Inc., Appellant, 134 vs. John C. Denney, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Thomas E. DeWolfe for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. DeLacy, It is ordered that Eugene E. Stevens, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. DeLacy, It is ordered that Reni S. Berry, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Watkins, It is ordered that Simon Rosenthal, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Louis H. Strasser, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John A. Coleman, It is ordered that Edward Fitzpatrick, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Watkins, It is ordered that Robert Clark Stovall, Esquire, of Okolona, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 199 vs. Samuel F. Houston.	On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of James Craig Peacock, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
North Bend Stage Line, Inc., Appellant, 134 vs. John C. Denney, et al.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Thomas E. DeWolfe for the appellant and by Mr. Hance H. Cleland for the appellee. The Court declined to hear further argument.
Edward A. Pagel, as Administrator, etc. Petitioner, 176 vs. Selma Hallbom.	This case was argued by Mr. Charles A. Swenson for the petitioner, and the case was submitted by Mr. Fred W. Putnam for the respondent.
State Board of Tax Commissioners of the State of Indiana, et al., Appellants, 183 vs. Lafayette A. Jackson.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Joseph W. Hutchinson for the appellants; continued by Mr. William H. Thompson and Mr. Martin A. Schenck for the appellee; and concluded by Mr. George W. Hufsmith for the appellants.
Leonard J. Woodruff, et al., Appellants, 165 vs. The City of Los Angeles.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. James A. Coleman for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph A. Cusick, It is ordered that Harvey L. Rabbitt, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore W. Brazeau, It is ordered that R. B. Graves, Esquire, of Wisconsin Rapids, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph A. Cusick, It is ordered that Harry T. Lore, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that William A. Boekel, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick O. Roth, It is ordered that Ernest K. Neumann, Esquire, of Santa Fe, State of New Mexico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. Vincent Carter, It is ordered that Thomas M. McKinney, Esquire, of Basin, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. Vincent Carter, It is ordered that John L. Landfair, Esquire, of Basin, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America ex rel. Ethel M. McLennan, Petitioner,
618 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior;
The United States of America ex rel. H. H. Simpson, Petitioner,
676 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, et al.;
The United States of America ex rel. Roy G. Barton, Petitioner,
704 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, et al.;
The United States of America ex rel. W. B. Pyron, Petitioner,
743 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long for the petitioners.

Leonard J. Woodruff, et al.,
Appellants,
165 vs.
The City of Los Angeles.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. J. A. Coleman for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Farbwerke Vormals Meister Lucius & Bruning, et al., etc., Petitioners,

179 vs.

Chemical Foundation, Inc., et al.;

Farbwerke Vormals Meister Lucius & Bruning, Petitioner,

180 vs.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. et al.;

Deutsche Gold & Silber Scheide Anstalt Vorm. Roessler, Petitioner,

181 vs.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. et al.;

Badische-Anilin & Soda-Fabrik, Petitioner,

182 vs.

E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. et al.;

Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of the United States, Petitioner,

271 vs.

The Chemical Foundation, Inc., et al.;

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, Petitioner,

272 vs.

Farbwerke Vormals Meister Lucius & Bruning, et al.;

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, Petitioner,

273 vs.

Deutsche Gold & Silber Scheide Anstalt Vorm. Roessler, et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for Farbwerke Vormals Meister Lucius & Bruning; continued by Mr. Almuth C. Vandiver for Badische-Anilin & Soda-Fabrik, et al.; by Mr. C. Carroll Todd for respondent, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., and concluded by Mr. Joseph H. Choate, Jr., for respondent, Chemical Foundation, Inc.; and the cases were submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. J. Frank Staley, and Mr. Thomas E. Rhodes for Walter O. Woods, Treasurer, and Howard Sutherland, Alien Property Custodian. Leave was granted to file supplemental brief of Farbwerke Vormals Meister Lucius & Bruning on or before Wednesday next, on motion of Mr. Frederick H. Wood in that behalf. Leave was granted to file reply brief of Chemical Foundation, Inc., on or before Wednesday next, on motion of Mr. Joseph H. Choate, Jr., in that behalf.

Columbus & Greenville Railway Company, et al., Appellants, and Petitioners, vs. W. J. Miller, State Tax Collector, etc. 195	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William H. Watkins for the appellants and petitioners, and continued by Mr. Simon Rosenthal for the appellee and respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chauncey C. Parker, It is ordered that Saul J. Zucker, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence M. Fisher, It is ordered that Raymond F. Adams, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kemper K. Knapp, It is ordered that John Howard Hershberger, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton Albert Kallis, It is ordered that Paul G. Annes, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas H. Gibson, It is ordered that Raymond L. Sauter, Esquire, of Sterling, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Stuart H. Elliott, Esquire, of Tacoma, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Marion N. Fisher, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Marsden B. Candler, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that R. Aubrey Bogley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that William H. Riley, Jr., Esquire, of Battle Creek, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company,

Appellant,

73 vs.

United States of America, Guyandot and Tug River Railroad Company, Norfolk and Western Railway Company, and Interstate Commerce Commission.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Carbice Corporation of America,

Petitioner,

54 vs.

American Patents Development Corporation and Dry Ice Corporation of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States CircuitCourt of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

William W. McBoyle,
Petitioner,
552 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

DeForest Radio Company,
Petitioner,
630 vs.
General Electric Company.

On consideration of the motion to use the records as printed for the use of the Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America ex rel. Ethel M. McLennan, Petitioner,

618 vs.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary, etc.;

The United States of America ex rel. H. H. Simpson, Petitioner,

676 vs.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary, etc., et al.;

The United States of America ex rel. Roy G. Barton, Petitioner,

704 vs.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary, etc.;

The United States ofAmerica ex rel. W. B. Pyron, Petitioner,

743 vs.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary, etc., et al.;

On consideration of the motion to advance these causes, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases are assigned for argument on Monday, April 13 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Walter C. Fetters, United States Marshal, etc., Petitioner,

720 vs.

United States of America ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.

O R D E R.

It is ordered by the Court that this case be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, April 13 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Spencer Aldrich and Bankers Trust Company as Trustees for Louise A. Meissner, Spencer W. Aldrich, et al., Appellants, vs. The City of New York, Booth & Flynn, Ltd., and Frerick L. Cranford, Inc.

607 — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway, Appellant, vs. Carroll County and J. T. Hester, Trustee of Carroll County.

622 — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway,

Appellant,

623 vs.

Benton County, Tennessee, and J. C. Herrin, Trustee of Benton County.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Philadelphia Electric Company,

Appellant,

625 vs.

The City of Philadelphia.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

North Bend Stage Line, Inc.,

Appellant,

134 vs.

John C. Denney, Director; C. Rea Moore, Supervisor of Public Utilities, and James P. Neal, Supervisor of Transportation, etc., et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Leonard J. Woodruff, et al., Appellants,
165 vs.
The City of Los Angeles.

Appeal from the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Merchants Warehouse Company, Appellant,
635 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
Merchants Warehouse Company, et al., Appellants,
636 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
637 vs.
Merchants Warehouse Company, et al.;
The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, Appellant,
638 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, et al., Appellants,
639 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
640 vs.
The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, et al.;
The Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, Appellant,
641 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al., Appellants,
642 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;
The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
643 vs.
The Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al.

In these cases probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George T. Mitchell, Attorney General of the State of Mississippi, et al., etc.

Appellants,

671 vs.

Penny Stores, Inc.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cumberland Coal Company,

Petitioner,

687 vs.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cumberland Coal Company,

Petitioner,

688 vs.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cumberland Coal Company,

Petitioner,

689 vs.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cumberland Coal Company,
Petitioner,
690 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments
in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cumberland Coal Company,
Petitioner,
691 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments
in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Piedmont Coal Company,
Petitioner,
692 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments
in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Greene County Coal Company,
Petitioner,
693 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Virginian Railway Company,
Petitioner,
733 vs.
Boyd E. Chambers.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Virginian Railway Company,
Petitioner,
734 vs.
E. L. Fitzgerald.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner,
735 vs.
W. O. Hylton.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Blakely D. McCaughn, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
628 vs.
Zelia Gross Carnill, Executrix of the Estate of William Carnill, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
644 vs.
Jennie L. Hodgkins, Surviving Executrix of the Estate of Jefferson Hodgkins, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pacific Southwest Trust & Savings Bank, Formerly Los Angeles First National Trust & Savings Bank, etc., Executor, etc., Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

679

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Denver and Salt Lake Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. The Board of County Commissioners of Routt County. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

567

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Denver and Salt Lake Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. The Board of County Commissioners of Moffat County, Colorado. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

568

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles H. Randall, Hector Randall,
Eli G. Randall and Truman D. Randall,
trading as T. D. Randall & Company,
Petitioners,
627 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Field and Start, Inc.,
Petitioner,
697 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louise McGrew Moffett and Grace Torrance Clark, Administratrices,
Petitioners,
700 vs.
Helen Moffett, Jennie M. Lynn and John C. Lynn, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America, ex rel.
Vahan Cardashian,

Petitioner,

702 vs.

Edgar C. Snyder, United States Marshal, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,

Petitioner,

707 vs.

E. H. D'Avignon.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

708 vs.

Perry A. Shindledecker.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Willis T. Gridley and Gladys Wright, Petitioners,
710 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harvey M. Toy and Mabelle B. Lucas, individually, etc., Petitioners,
716 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Sixty-Seven South Munn, Inc., Petitioner,
719 vs.
Board of Public Utility Commissioners of New Jersey and Public Service Electric and Gas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Smoot Sand and Gravel Corporation,
Petitioner,
678 vs.
Washington Airport, Inc.

The motion to advance the case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Titus for the respondent.

T. F. Bandler,
Petitioner,
718 vs.
Mayer, Osterwald & Muhlfeld, Inc.

Leave was granted the petitioner to file reply brief on motion of Mr. H. Kennedy McCook for the petitioner.

Thomas L. Wolfe, et al.,
Appellants,
624 vs.
Patrick J. Hurley, Secretary of War, et al.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the appellants for leave to file out of time the statement of points to be relied upon, designation of parts of record to be printed and statement as to jurisdiction,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thomas L. Wolfe, et al.,
Appellants,
624 vs.
Patrick J. Hurley, Secretary of War, et al.

The motion to advance was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dean G. Acheson in behalf of counsel for the appellants.

Guy Spurrier and Gerata Cella Spurrier,
Appellants,
306 vs.
Mitchell Irrigation District and Goering & Ft. Laramie Irrigation District.

The motion to pass, per stipulation of counsel, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert G. Simmons in behalf of counsel.

V. Loewers Cambrinus Brewery Company, Petitioner,
352 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, Individually, etc.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the petitioner to have the mandate in this cause issued forthwith,
It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the mandate in this cause issue forthwith.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana), Appellant,
384 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

Diminution of the record in this case was suggested and the motion for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles T. Drayton for the appellant.

Commonwealth of Kentucky, Complainant,
15, Original. vs.
State of Indiana, et al.

The report No. 2 of the defendant, The State of Indiana, was presented to the Court.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana), Appellant,
384 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter McFarland, Mr. M. B. Pierce, Mr. F. H. Towner, and Mr. Louis H. Strasser for the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Ry. Co. and other carriers, appellees, in support of the motion, and by Mr. L. L. Stephens and Mr. John R. Cochran for the appellant in opposition thereto.

Ernest C. Marty and Therese Marty, his wife, Petitioners, vs. John D. Nagle, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of San Francisco. 615

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause.

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered by this Court that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Tri-State Ferry Company, Appellant, vs. R. I. Birney. 621

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation to dismiss the appeal in this cause at the cost of the appellant.

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company, et al., Appellants, vs. Allen J. Maxwell, Commissioner of Revenue of North Carolina. 649

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward H. Green, Mr. C. W. Tillett, Jr., Mr. Martin A. Schenck, Mr. William J. Carr, and Mr. Edward Holloway for the appellants.

Continental Products Company,
Petitioner,
656 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. R. Brown and Mr. J. Harry Covington for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Wisconsin Central Railway Company,
Petitioner,
675 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John L. Erdall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

T. J. Moss Tie Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
703 vs.
Lydia Tanner and Letus N. Crowell, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. Grove, Mr. John London, Mr. George W. Yancey, and Mr. Walter Brower for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. W. Clifton Stone, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent, Letus N. Crowell.

Mandy and Harman,
Petitioner,
709 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Breed for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John Henry McEvers for the respondent.

Iowa-Des Moines National Bank, Petitioner, 711 vs. J. M. Stewart, Chairman, etc.; Central State Bank, Petitioner, 712 vs. J. M. Stewart, Chairman, etc.	The petitions for writs of certiorar herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. G. Gamble and Mr. A. B. Howland for the petitioners, and by Mr. Eskil C. Carlson and Mr. Maxwell A. O'Brien for the respondents.
New York, Ontario & Western Railway Company, Petitioner, 715 vs. William W. Wyatt.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circu was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Watts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sol Gelb for the respondent.
The Union Central Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, 717 vs. Rena Harvey.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circu was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alva M. Lumpkin for the petitioner, and by Rena Harvey, pro se.
Letus N. Crowell, as Deputy Commissioner, etc., et al., Petitioners, 730 vs. Charles Benson; Letus N. Crowell, as Deputy Commissioner, etc., et al. Petitioners, 731 vs. Charles Benson.	The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. J. Frank Staley, and Mr. M. Clifton Stone for the petitioner in No. 730; by Mr. Palmer Pillans for petitioner J. B. Knudson, in No. 731; and by Mr. Vincent F. Kilborn for the respondent.

New York Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
736 vs.
Rose Rositzky.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph T. Finley, Mr. James C. Jones, Mr. Lon O. Hocker, Mr. James C. Jones, Jr., Mr. Frank H. Sullivan, and Mr. Louis H. Cooke for the petitioner, and by Mr. K. B. Randolph for the respondent.

Columbus & Greenville Railway Company, et al.,
Appellants and Petitioners,
195 vs.
W. J. Miller, State Tax Collector, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Simon Rosenthal for the appellee and respondent, and concluded by Mr. R. C. Stovall for the appellants and petitioners.

State of Arizona,
Complainant,
19, Original. vs.
State of California, State of Nevada, State of Utah, State of New Mexico, State of Colorado, State of Wyoming, and Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

Five and one-half hours allowed for the oral argument of this case on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in that behalf. The argument on the several motions to dismiss the bill of complaint was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the defendant, Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, in support of his motion; continued by Mr. U. S. Webb for the defendant, The State of California; by Mr. Thomas H. Gibson for the defendant, The State of Colorado; and by Mr. George P. Parker for the defendant, The State of Utah, in support of their motions.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene L. Culver, It is ordered that Frederick Edward Westbrook Darrow, Esquire, of Saugerties, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Gore, It is ordered that W. H. Brown, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Regis Noel, It is ordered that Vinton Emory Bradford, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas P. Gore, It is ordered that A. L. Hull, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Guy Spurrier, et al.,
Appellants,
306 vs.
Mitchell Irrigation District, et al.

On consideration of the motion and stipulation of counsel to pass this case, It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that the case be passed until April 13 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Arizona,
Complainant,
19, Original. vs.
The State of California, The State of Nevada, The State of Utah, The State of New Mexico, The State of Colorado, The State of Wyoming, and Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

The argument of this case on the several motions to dismiss was continued by Mr. James A. Greenwood for defendant, The State of Wyoming, in support of its motion; by Mr. Dean G. Acheson and Mr. Clifton Mathews for the complainant, State of Arizona, in opposition thereto; and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the defendant, Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, in support of his motion. The case was submitted by Mr. Gray Mashburn for defendant, The State of Nevada, and by Mr. E. K. Neumann and Mr. Francis C. Wilson for defendant, the State of New Mexico, in support of their motions to dismiss.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Appellant,
193 vs.
Hal Norwood, Attorney General of the State of Arkansas, etc., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Edward J. White for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Donald R. Richberg for the appellees.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Clarke Mason, It is ordered that John Russell, Jr., Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas R. FitzSimmons, It is ordered that William Fox Geenty, Esquire, of New Haven, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins, It is ordered that Phil Dice Morelock, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Owens, It is ordered that Geo. H. Hubbell, Esquire, of Trenton, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, It is ordered that Louis E. Callis, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Appellant,
193 vs.
Hal Norwood, Attorney General of the State of Arkansas, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Donald R. Richberg for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Edward J. White for the appellant.

Nekoosa Edwards Paper Company,
Appellant,
218 vs.
Railroad Commission of Wisconsin.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. R. B. Graves for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Theodore W. Brazeau for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
129 vs.
Sybil Whitehouse.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, and by Mr. Marion N. Fisher for the respondent.

Hilary Halbert, Jr., et al., etc., Petitioners,

141 vs.

The United States of America;

Rich Halbert, a minor, etc., Petitioner,

142 vs.

The United States of America;

Vernon Sidney Halbert, a minor, etc., Petitioner,

143 vs.

The United States of America;

Sidney E. Halbert, a minor, etc., Petitioner,

144 vs.

The United States of America;

Rose Peers Pickernoll, et al., Petitioners,

145 vs.

The United States of America;

Lulu M. Elliott, et al., etc., Petitioners,

146 vs.

The United States of America;

Mary Barichio Petit, et al., Petitioners,

147 vs.

The United States of America;

Dewey Barichio, et al., Petitioners,

148 vs.

The United States of America;

Edna May Elliott, et al., Petitioners,

149 vs.

The United States of America;

Chas. C. Elliott, Jr., et al., Petitioners,

150 vs.

The United States of America;

Agnes Rubens, et al., Petitioners,

151 vs.

The United States of America;

Virginia Walkowsky, et al., Petitioners,

152 vs.

The United States of America;

Lizzie Rolfson, et al., Petitioners,

153 vs.

The United States of America;

Mary Francis Provoe, et al, Petitioners,

154 vs.

The United States of America.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Webster Ballinger for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. B. Saul, It is ordered that William E. Mikell, Jr., Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. B. Saul, It is ordered that Robert C. Walker, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. B. Saul, It is ordered that Earl Grant Harrison, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. B. Saul, It is ordered that Ulric Johnson Mengert, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert N. Miller, It is ordered that Henry Herrick Bond, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. M. B. Saul, It is ordered that Daniel R. Rothermel, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Louisiana,
Complainant,
8, Original. vs.
The State of Mississippi.

The proposed form of decree herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in that behalf.

Maas & Waldstein Company,
Petitioner,
263 vs.
The United States.

This case was submitted by Mr. George E. Holmes, Mr. W. A. Sutherland, and Mr. Donald Havens for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Charles R. Pollard for the respondent.

The George E. Breece Lumber Company, et al.,
Appellants,
264 vs.
Rupert E. Asplund, State Comptroller of the State of New Mexico.

This case was submitted by Mr. Clarence M. Botts for the appellants and by Mr. E. K. Neuman and Mr. E. R. Wright for the appellee.

Hilary Halbert, Jr., et al., etc., Petitioners,
141 vs.
The United States of America;

Rich Halbert, a minor, etc., Petitioner,
142 vs.
The United States of America;

Vernon Sidney Halbert, a minor, etc., Petitioner,
143 vs.
The United States of America;

Sidney E. Halbert, a minor, etc., Petitioner,
144 vs.
The United States of America;

Rose Peers Pickernell, et al., Petitioners,
145 vs.
The United States of America;

Lulu M. Elliott, et al., etc., Petitioners,
146 vs.
The United States of America;

Mary Barichio Petit, et al., Petitioners,
147 vs.
The United States of America;

Dewey Barichio, et al., Petitioners,
148 vs.
The United States of America;

Edna May Elliott, et al., Petitioners,
149 vs.
The United States of America;

Charles G. Elliott, Jr., et al., Petitioners,
150 vs.
The United States of America;

Agnes Rubens, et al., Petitioners,
151 vs.
The United States of America;

Virginia Walkowsky, et al., Petitioners,
152 vs.
The United States of America;

Lizzie Rolfson, et al., Petitioners,
153 vs.
The United States of America;

Mary Francis Provoe, et al., Petitioners,
154 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Webster [illegible] for the petitioners, with leave to petitioners to file supplemental briefs within five days.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
199 vs.
Samuel F. Houston.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
202 vs.
Sallie H. Henry;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
203 vs.
William Hobart Porter, et al., Executors, etc.

These cases were argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, by Mr. William Clark Mason for the respondent in No. 202, and by Mr. Walter Lee Sheppard for the respondent in No. 203.

Edward F. Flynn, as Executor, etc., Petitioner,
235 vs.
New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad Company.

This case was argued by Mr. William F. Geenty for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward R. Brumley for the respondent.

Alvis Maynard, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
239 vs.
W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.;
John B. Varney, Petitioner,
240 vs.
W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.;
J.M.Smith and A.B.Scott, Petitioners,
241 vs.
W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.;
A. C. Rutherford, Petitioner,
242 vs.
W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Randolph Bias for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 13, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elton L. Marshall, It is ordered that William M. Allen, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor at this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
109 vs.
National Industrial Alcohol Company, Inc.

On consideration of the motion of counsel in behalf of respondent for the immediate issuance of the mandate in this cause;

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that the mandate issue forthwith.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alvis Maynard, Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner,
239 vs.
W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.;
John B. Varney, Petitioner,
240 vs.
W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.;
J. M. Smith and A. B. Scott, Petitioners,
241 vs.
W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.;
A. G. Rutherford, Petitioner,
242 vs.
W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Randolph Bias for the petitioners; by Mr. Stanley Reed for the respondent; and concluded by Mr. Wells Goodykoontz for the petitioners.

The United States,
Petitioner,
252 vs.
Artemus C. Wells, et al., Executors, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. W. Spalding for the respondents.

Standard Marine Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
261 vs.
Scottish Metropolitan Assurance
Company, Ltd.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Russell T. Mount for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that Burton B. Turkus, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James B. McDonough, It is ordered that Harry P. Daily, Esquire, of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Strong, It is ordered that Kenneth L. Sater, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that James H. Griswold, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. F. Barry, Jr., It is ordered that J. Carlton Loser, Esquire, of Nashville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward B. Klewer, It is ordered that W. B. Rosenfield, Esquire, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Wallance, It is ordered that E. Russell Lutz, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Leo A. Rover, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that Milton W. King, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Strong, It is ordered that Myer I. Goldberg, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richmond B. Keech, It is ordered that Ruby Robinson Miller, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that George M. Lynch, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The Commonwealth of Kentucky, Complainant,
15, Original. vs.
The State of Indiana, et al.

ORDER.

Report No. 2 of defendant, the State of Indiana, is received and ordered to be filed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Smoot Sand and Gravel Corporation, Petitioner,
678 vs.
Washington Airport, Incorporated.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, April 13 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana), Appellant,
384 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the suggestion of a diminution of the record and motion for writ of certiorari and of the motion to dismiss or affirm be postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company, et al., Appellants, vs. Allen J. Maxwell, Commissioner, etc. — In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

649

Mekoosa Edwards Paper Company, Appellant, vs. Railroad Commission of Wisconsin. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

218

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The George E. Breece Lumber Company and Southwest Lumber Company, Appellants, vs. Rupert F. Asplund, State Comptroller of the State of New Mexico. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

264

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Handy and Harman,

Petitioner,

709 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Iowa-Des Moines National Bank,

Petitioner,

711 vs.

J. M. Stewart, Chairman of the Board of Supervisors of Polk County, Iowa, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Central State Bank,

Petitioner,

712 vs.

J. M. Stewart, Chairman of the Board of Supervisors of Polk County, Iowa, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Letus N. Crowell, as Deputy Commissioner for the Seventh Compensation District of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, Petitioner,
730 vs.
Charles Benson.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Letus N. Crowell, as Deputy Commissioner for the Seventh Compensation District of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission and J. B. Knudson, Petitioners,
731 vs.
Charles Benson.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

E. F. Bandler, Petitioner,
718 vs.
Mayers, Osterwald & Muhlfeld, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Continental Products Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

656 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wisconsin Central Railway Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

675 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

T. J. Moss Tie Company and American Mutual Liability Insurance Company,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

703 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Lydia Tanner and Letus N. Crowell, of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New York, Ontario & Western Railway Company, Petitioner,

715 vs.

William W. Wyatt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Union Central Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,

717 vs.

Rena Harvey.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New York Life Insurance Company, Petitioner,

736 vs.

Rose Rositzky.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order:

ORDER.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, March 23, until Monday, April 13, next.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
16, Original. vs.
The State of New York and The City of New York.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file exceptions of the defendants to the report of the Special Master,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
16, Original. vs.
The State of New York and The City of New York.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file exceptions of the complainant to the report of the Special Master,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Story Parchment Company,
Petitioner,
57 vs.
The Paterson Parchment Paper Company, et al.

The motion for the allowance of counsel fees and motion to stay mandate was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward O. Proctor for the petitioner in support of the motions, and by Mr. Edward F. McClennen for the respondent, in opposition to the motion for counsel fees.

Merchants Warehouse Company, Appellant,

635 vs.

The United States of America; et al.;

Merchants Warehouse Company, et al., Appellants,

636 vs.

The United States of America, et al;

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,

637 vs.

Merchants Warehouse Company, et al.;

The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, Appellant,

638 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, et al., Appellants,

639 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,

640 vs.

The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, et al.;

The Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al., Appellants,

641 vs.

The United States, of America, et al.;

Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al., Appellants,

642 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,

643 vs.

The Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al.

The motion to reassign these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen S. Olmstead, 2d, in that behalf.

Western Land & Reclamation Company, Appellant,
290 vs.
The Reclamation Board of the State of California, et al.

On consideration of the motion in behalf of counsel for the appellant to pass and assign this case for argument on Monday, April 20 next, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, with leave to file supplemental briefs on or before April 13 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.
Ex parte: Eastern Transportation Company, et al., Petitioners.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Hickox for the petitioners.

John F. L. O'Leary and Henry J. Sullivan, Petitioners,
786 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip A. McHugh for the petitioners.

The Hardware Dealers Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Wisconsin, Appellant,
665 vs.
The Glidden Company, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mortimer H. Boutelle and Mr. Nathan H. Chase for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Arthur E. Nelson and Mr. Edward L. Boyle for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

The Texas and Pacific Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
744 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Freeman, Mr. Robert L. W. Thompson, Mr. Luther M. Walter, Mr. A. J. Harris, Mr. R. E. Milling, Jr., and Mr. Leroy Laist for the appellants.

Associated Furniture Corporation, Petitioner,
664 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Montgomery, Mr. Thomas G. Haight, and Mr. J. Marvin Haynes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

United States ex rel. Antonio di Stefano, Petitioner,
705 vs.
Fred S. Pulver, United States Marshal, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Antonio di Stefano, pro se, and by Mr. Eugene E. Kelly for the respondents.

The City of San Diego, Petitioner,
713 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. W. Conkling for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert O. Brennan and Mr. E. E. McInnis for the respondent.

Pig Stand Company, Petitioner,
722 vs.
Dixiepig Corporation, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Fifth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Davis for the petitioner.

Northwestern Lumber Company, Petitioner,
723 vs.
Wisconsin Tax Commission, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. M. Beach for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Reynolds for the respondents.

John S. Owen Lumber Company, Petitioner,
724 vs.
Wisconsin Tax Commission, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. M. Beach for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Reynolds for the respondents.

Rust-Owen Lumber Company, Petitioner,
725 vs.
Wisconsin Tax Commission, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. M. Beach for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Reynolds for the respondents.

New Dells Lumber Company, Petitioner,
726 vs.
Wisconsin Tax Commission, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. M. Beach for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Reynolds for the respondents.

Paysoff Tinkoff, Petitioner,
727 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, individually, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Bennett and Mr. Paysoff Tinkoff for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Frank Staley, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Sadaichi Kenmotsu, Petitioner, 729 vs. John D. Nagle, United States Commissioner at San Francisco, California.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carol W. King for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.
Clarence Craig, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc., Petitioner, 732 vs. Industrial Acceptance Corporation.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen McReynolds for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter E. Beebe for the respondent.
William Wingert, et al., etc., Petitioners, 741 vs. The President, Directors, and Company of the Hagerstown Bank, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Miller Wingert for the petitioners.
Louis L. Smith, Petitioner, 742 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Waguespack for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Frank Staley, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
745 vs.
William L. Nevin, Executor, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, and Mr. Patrick J. Ryan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Maurice Bower Saul and Mr. J. Marvin Haynes for the respondent.

A. M. Randolph, Petitioner,
746 vs.
Edward Fricke.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Grover for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. J. Jones and Mr. Major J. Lilly for the respondent.

Patent Vulcanite Roofing Company, Inc., Petitioner,
749 vs.
Transoceanica Societa Italiana Di Navigazione.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur W. Clement and Mr. Oscar R. Houston for the petitioner, and by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the respondent.

Ingram-Day Lumber Company, Petitioner,
760 vs.
Clare G. Schultz, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Armbrecht for the petitioner, and by Mr. Michael F. Gallagher and Mr. Samuel K. Rinaker for the respondent.

W. H. Shenners Company,
Petitioner,
765 vs.
Lake Worth Realty & Building Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar L. Wood for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles B. Quarles ~~Mr. Maxwell H. Herriott~~ for the respondent.

Standard Marine Insurance Company, Ltd.
Petitioner,
261 vs.
Scottish Metropolitan Assurance Company, Ltd.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Russell T. Mount for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. T. Catesby Jones for the respondent.

Alfred Scott Aldridge,
Petitioner,
683 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. James F. Reilly for the petitioner, and by Mr. Leo A. Rover for the respondent.

Bonwit Teller & Company,
Petitioner,
282 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Arthur B. Hyman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner,
Petitioner,
288 vs.
Thompson Oil and Gas Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph B. Stewart, It is ordered that Justin Lincoln Fearing, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that Denver L. Dudley, Esquire, of Jonesboro, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that John E. Mathews, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, It is ordered that William H. Allen, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Charles A. Noack, et al.,
Appellants,
361 vs.
I. Zellerbach, et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth and Mr. Roger O'Donnell for the appellants, and by Mr. Eugene D. Bennett for the appellees. Leave was granted appellees to file brief on or before April 7 next, on motion of Mr. Ellsworth C. Alvord, in behalf of counsel.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
288 vs.
Thompson Oil & Gas Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the petitioner, by Mr. Phil D. Morelock for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins for the respondent.

Will Walker and Alfred Walker, et al.,
Appellants,
313 vs.
Lawrence Mensi, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. B. Rosenfield for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Hannah M. Smith, Administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
315 vs.
Springdale Amusement Park, Ltd., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Myer I. Goldberg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Paul Bakewell for the respondents.

Twin City Pipe Line Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
330 vs.
Harding Glass Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Harry P. Daily for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John R. Cochran, It is ordered that Harry I. Allen, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Twin City Pipe Line Company, et al., Petitioners,
330 vs.
Harding Glass Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Harry P. Daily for the petitioners, by Mr. Joseph R. Brown and Mr. James B. McDonough for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Harry P. Daily for the petitioners.

Hans Rees' Sons, Inc., Appellant,
334 vs.
State of North Carolina ex rel. Allen J. Maxwell, Commissioner of Revenue.

This case was argued by Mr. Louis M. Porter for the appellant, and by Mr. Dennis G. Brummitt for the appellee.

Southern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

342 vs.

Jack W. Hussey.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles A. Houts for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. H. Caraway, It is ordered that Ozero C. Brewer, Esquire, of Helena, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert H. Archer, It is ordered that Charles H. Mac Nabb, Esquire, of Cardiff, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis H. Strasser, It is ordered that Herbert S. Harr, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Schwertner, It is ordered that Francis J. Burke, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Southern Railway Company, Petitioners, 342 vs. Jack W. Hussey.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Charles A. Houts for the petitioner and concluded by Mr. William M. Allen for the respondent.
A. James Eckert, Petitioner, 351 vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	This case was argued by Mr. Henry T. Dorrance for the petitioner, and by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.
Interstate Transit, Inc., Appellant, 358 vs. Dick Lindsey, County Court Clerk.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. Carlton Loser for the appellant; continued by Mr. William F. Barry, Jr., for the appellee; and concluded by Mr. Thomas L. Tallentire for the appellant.
The Susquehanna Power Company, Appellant, 368 vs. State Tax Commission of Maryland.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the appellant, and continued by Mr. William L. Marbury, Jr., for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, MARCH 20, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic P. Lee, It is ordered that Harmon E. Cutler, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore T. Golden, It is ordered that Ambrose Bradley, Esquire, of Waynesburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles S. Baker, It is ordered that Terence F. Cunneen, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
745 vs.
William L. Nevin, Executor, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Dean G. Acheson, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Mary B. Warburton and Norman McLeod, administrator, Estate of Elizabeth McLeod, as amici curiae, in this cause.

Carbice Corporation of America, Petitioner, vs. American Patents Development Corporation, et al. 54	The motion to defer the consideration of the motion by the petitioner for reconsideration, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. F. Steward for the respondents.
The State of New Jersey, Complainant, vs. The City of New York. 17, Original.	The report of the Special Master herein was presented by Mr. Edward K. Campbell and the report ordered to be filed.
The Susquehanna Power Company, Appellant, vs. State Tax Commission of Maryland. 368	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. William L. Marbury, Jr., and Mr. Robert H. Archer for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the appellant.
The Susquehanna Power Company, Appellant, vs. State Tax Commission of Maryland. 369	This case was argued by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the appellant, and by Mr. William L. Marbury, Jr. and Mr. Charles H. MacNabb for the appellee.
Standard Oil Company (Indiana), Appellant, vs. The United States of America, et al. 384	This case was argued by Mr. John R. Cochran for the appellant, by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission, and by Mr. Louis H. Strasser for the appellee carriers.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, March 23 next, at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herbert S. Ward, It is ordered that Louis O. Bergh, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Whitney North Seymour, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Clay McClellan, Esquire, of Waco, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eliot C. Lovett, It is ordered that Horace Edison Gunn, Esquire, of Danville, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond J. Mawhinney, It is ordered that Asahel W. Cooper, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Gynther Storaasli,

Appellant,

393 vs.

The State of Minnesota.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Mr. Justice Butler took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Demetrius Philippides,

Petitioner,

92 vs.

Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration, Port of New York.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

United States of America ex rel.
Costas Cateches,

Petitioner,

336 vs.

Benjamin M. Day, Commissioner of Immigration.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Walter E. Carr, Director of Immigration of the United States for the Los Angeles District No. 31,

Petitioner,

125 vs.

Mateo Zaja.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Edward F. Flynn, as Executor of the Estate of Edward L. Flynn, Deceased,

Petitioner,

235 vs.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Errors, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

85 vs.

Munson Steamship Line.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

In Re Disbarment of William E. Baff.

It having been shown to the Court that William E. Baff, of Los Angeles, California, has been disbarred from the practice of the law in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California.

Therefore, It is now here ordered by the Court that a rule issue, returnable April 13, 1931, to the said William E. Baff, ordering him to show cause why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court and his name stricken from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice here.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

2, Original. The State of New Mexico, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant.

[March 23, 1931.]

On consideration of the report of Samuel S. Gannett, the Commissioner heretofore selected to run, locate and mark the boundary between the State of New Mexico and the State of Texas in the Valley of the Rio Grande River extending southwardly from the parallel of 32° north latitude to the parallel of 31° 47′ on the international boundary between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico, which report was presented herein October 6, 1930; and no objection or exception to such report being presented, although the time therefor has expired;

It is now ADJUDGED, ORDERED AND DECREED as follows:

1. The said report is in all things confirmed;

2. The boundary line delineated and set forth in the said report and on the accompanying maps is established and declared to be the true boundary between the States of New Mexico and Texas in the Valley of the Rio Grande River from the parallel of 32° north latitude to the parallel of 31° 47′ on the international boundary between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico;

3. As it appears that the said Commissioner has completed his work conformably to the decree of this Court of April 9, 1928 (276 U. S. 558), the said Commissioner is hereby discharged;

4. The Clerk of this Court shall transmit to the Chief Magistrates of the States of New Mexico and Texas copies of this decree, duly authenticated under the seal of this Court, together with copies of the report of the Commissioner and of the accompanying maps;

5. The Clerk of this Court shall distribute and deliver to the Chief Magistrates of the States of New Mexico and Texas and to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, all copies of the report of the Commissioner, with the accompanying maps, now in his hands, save that he shall retain three copies of each for such purposes as may arise in his office;

6. The costs in this cause shall be borne and paid in equal parts by the States of New Mexico and Texas.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of New Mexico, Complainant,
2, Original. vs.
The State of Texas, Defendant.

[March 23, 1931.]

The report presented herein October 6, 1930, by the Boundary Commissioner, showing the work done, time employed and expenses incurred in the survey, marking and mapping of the boundary between the States of New Mexico and Texas in the Valley of the Rio Grande River extending southwardly from the parallel of 32° north latitude to the parallel of 31° 47′ on the international boundary between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico, pursuant to the decree of this Court of April 9, 1928 (276 U. S. 558), is approved and adopted. The compensation of the Commissioner for the work done by him as shown in such report is fixed at $9,350; and it appearing from such report and from the papers subsequently filed herein that the two States have borne and paid in equal shares the expenses incurred in the said work, including the compensation here allowed to the Commissioner, it is

ORDERED that the action of the two States in this regard be approved.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Connecticut,
12, Original. vs.
The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

[March 23, 1931.]

DECREE.

This cause came on to be heard upon the pleadings, evidence, and the exceptions filed by the complainant to the Report of the Special Master, and was argued by counsel. The Court now being fully advised in the premises and for the purpose of carrying into effect the conclusions set forth in the opinion of this Court announced February 24, 1931,

It is now here ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED as follows:

First that the Bill of Complaint herein be and the same hereby is, dismissed without prejudice to the right of the complainant to maintain a further suit against the defendant at any time in the future when it shall appear that substantial interests of the State of Connecticut are in fact being injured, or are about to be injured, through a material increase of the amount of the waters of the Ware River and of the Swift River diverted or to be diverted by, or under the authority of, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, over and above the quantities authorized to be diverted by the provisions of Chapter 375 of the Acts of 1926 and by Chapter 321 of the Acts of 1927 of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as said quantities have heretofore been limited by two certain findings of the Secretary of War of the United States, acting upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, dated respectively March 14, 1928, and May 11, 1929, and more fully set out in Appendix B and Appendix C of the Reprint of the Answer of the Defendant herein, filed January 20, 1930, and of Record in this cause.

Second that each party shall pay its own costs, together with one-half of the expenses incurred by the Special Master, Charles W. Bunn, Esquire, of St Paul, Minnesota, and one-half of the amount fixed by the Court as the compensation of the Special Master.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,

17, Original. vs.

The City of New York.

The report of the Special Master is received and ordered to be filed. Exceptions by the parties, if any, shall be filed on or before Monday, April 6th next, and the case is assigned for hearing on such exceptions, if any, on Thursday, April 30th next, at the head of the call for that day. Briefs for the parties shall be filed on or before Monday, April 20th. Reply briefs, if any, are to be filed on or before Monday, April 27th.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.

Ex Parte: Eastern Transportation Company, et al., Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus and/or prohibition herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John F. L. O'Leary and Henry J. Sullivan, Petitioners,

786 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John F. L. O'Leary and Henry J. Sullivan, Petitioners,
786 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Will Walker and Alfred Walker, et al., Appellants,
313 vs.
Lawrence Mensi, Brill Willis, Horace Colby, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Merchants Warehouse Company, Appellant,

635 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

Merchants Warehouse Company, et al., Appellants,

636 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,

637 vs.

Merchants Warehouse Company, et al.;

The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, Appellant,

638 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, et al., Appellants,

639 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,

640 vs.

The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, et al.;

The Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, Appellant,

641 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al., Appellants,

642 vs.

The United States of America, et al.;

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,

643 vs.

The Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion to reassign these cases for argument,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cases are reassigned for argument on Tuesday, April 21 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice [illegible]es.

The Hardware Dealers Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Wisconsin,
Appellant,
665 vs.
The Glidden Company, et al.,

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this cause be postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Texas and Pacific Railway Company, et al.,
Appellants,
744 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Associates Furniture Corporation,
Petitioner,
664 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States ex rel. Antonio di Stefano,
Petitioner,
705 vs.
Fred S. Pulver, United States Marshal for the Eastern District of New York, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The City of San Diego, a municipal corporation, Petitioner, vs. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company.

713 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pig Stand Company, Petitioner, vs. Dixiepig Corporation, et al.

722 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, 5th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 5th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Northwestern Lumber Company, Petitioner, vs. Wisconsin Tax Commission, W. J. Conway, Pearce Tomkins, etc.

723 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John S. Owen Lumber Company,

Petitioner,

724 vs.

Wisconsin Tax Commission, W. J. Conway, Pearce Tomkins, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Rust-Owen Lumber Company,

Petitioner,

725 vs.

Wisconsin Tax Commission, W. J. Conway Pearce Tomkins, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New Dells Lumber Company,

Petitioner,

726 vs.

Wisconsin Tax Commission, W. J. Conway, Pearce Tomkins, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Paysoff Tinkoff,
Petitioner,
727 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Individually, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sadaichi Kenmotsu,
Petitioner,
729 vs.
John D. Nagle, United States Commissioner at San Francisco, California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Clarence Craig, Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Estate of Bell Motor Company, a Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
732 vs.
Industrial Acceptance Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Wingert, Lewis P. Wingert and
Miller Wingert, and Miller Wingert,
Executors, etc., Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari
741 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
The President, Directors and Company of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.
of the Hagerstown Bank, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louis L. Smith, On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court
742 vs. of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. M. Randolph, On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioner, to the Supreme Court of the
746 vs. State of Missouri.
Edward Fricke.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Patent Vulcanite Roofing Company,
Inc., Petitioner,
749 vs.
Transoceanica Societa Italiana Di
Navigazione.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ingram-Day Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
760 vs.
Clare G. Schultz, Administratrix of
the Estate of W. W. Schultz.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. H. Shenners Company,
Petitioner,
765 vs.
Lake Worth Realty & Building Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Complainant, 22, Original. vs. State of Oregon.	The motion for the appointment of a Special Master herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the complainant.
—, Original. Ex parte: Frank L. Smith, et al., etc. Petitioners,	The motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eliot G. Lovet in behalf of counsel for the petitioners.
The United States, Petitioner, 504 vs. Douglas Clyde Macintosh; The United States of America, Petitioner, 505 vs. Marie Averil Bland.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. Dean G. Acheson, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Charles P. Howland and Richard W. Hale, as amici curiae, in these causes.
Liberty Central Trust Company, et al., Appellants, 698 vs. Greenbrier College for Women, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. Chapman Revercomb for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. Howard B. Lee and Mr. R. A. Blessing for the appellees, in opposition thereto.
United States ex rel. Empire & Southeastern Railway Company, etc., Petitioner, 728 vs. Interstate Commerce Commission.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paysoff Tinkoff and Mr. John E. Bennett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Nelson W. Thomas and Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the respondent.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company, Petitioner,
737 vs.
R. F. Highfill.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, Mr. Charles S. Burg, and Mr. Maurice D. Green for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondent.

Simons Brick Company, Petitioner,
747 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Brennan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John G. Remey, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Crider Brothers Commission Company, Petitioner,
755 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Levi Cooke, Mr. J. Walter Farrar, and Mr. Geo. R. Beneman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. William Butler Thompson, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Rogers & Hubbard, Petitioner,
784 vs.
Hartford & New York Transportation Company;
Rogers & Hubbard, Petitioner,
785 vs.
Hartford & New York Transportation Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Crandall for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Griffin for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court [illegible]

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, It is ordered that William H. Dannat Pell, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh Reid, It is ordered that Edwin H. Gibson, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond J. Mawhinney, It is ordered that James Wilkinson, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dallas S. Townsend, It is ordered that Henry W. Boyce, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
vs.
Thompson Oil & Gas Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

288

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Edward A. Pagel, as Administrator of
the Estate of Jacob K. Hallbom, Decedent,
Petitioner,
vs.
John G. MacLean, Administrator of the
Estate of Selma Hallbom, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

176

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be and the same is hereby, vacated, without costs to either party in this Court; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

116 vs. Court of Claims.

Felt & Tarrant Mfg. Co.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Alvis Maynard, Administrator of Mary A. Ronan, Deceased,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the United

239 vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for

W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy the Sixth Circuit.

of Nancy Jane Varney and Pricy A. Varney.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

John B. Varney,

Petitioner,

240 vs.

W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Nancy Jane Varney and Price A. Varney.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

J. M. Smith and A. B. Scott,

Petitioners,

241 vs.

W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Nancy Jane Varney and Price A. Varney.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

A. G. Rutherford,

Petitioner,

242 vs.

W. K. Elliott, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Nancy Jane Varney and Pricy A. Varney.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Group No. 1 Oil Corporation,

Petitioner,

425 vs.

James W. Bass, Collector of Internal Revenue for the United States for the First District of Texas.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Standard Marine Insurance Company,
Ltd., Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the United
261 vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for
Scottish Metropolitan Assurance the Sixth Circuit.
Company, Ltd.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeal in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Ohio.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The Susquehanna Power Company,
Appellant, Appeal from the Court of Appeals
368 vs. of the State of Maryland.
State Tax Commission of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The Susquehanna Power Company,

Appellant,

369 vs.

State Tax Commission of Maryland.

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Maryland, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

New York Life Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

93 vs.

Frank Gollis Bowers, Executor of the Estate of Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Frank Collis Bowers, Executor of the Estate of Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York, Petitioner, vs. New York Life Insurance Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. — 160

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant, vs. Hal Norwood, Attorney General of the State of Arkansas; Joe Joiner, Prosecuting Attorney for the Thirteenth Circuit of Arkansas, et al., etc. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas. — 193

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, without prejudice to any application to the District Court to amend the pleadings or otherwise.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Bonwit Teller & Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

282 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of

155 vs. Virginia.

H. M. Martin and W. H. Porter.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
vs.
Samuel F. Houston.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

199

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
vs.
Sallie H. Henry.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

202

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

203 vs.

William Hobart Porter and Andrew W. Porter, Executors of the Estate of William W. Porter, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Etta M. Klein, Former Administratrix of the Estate of Solomon Klein, Deceased, etc., et al.,

Petitioners,

387 vs.

The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana),

Appellant,

384 vs.

The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record fro the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Indiana and on motion of the carrier appellees to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and de- creed by this Court that the order of dismissal of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana), Standard Oil Company (New Jersey), Standard Development Company, et al.,

Appellants,

378 vs.

The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and de- creed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the bill of complaint.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Interstate Transit, Inc.,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

358 vs. State of Tennessee.

Dick Lindsey, County Court Clerk.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice McReynolds is of the opinion that the judgment should be affirmed.

Gene Buck, as President of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, and De Sylva, Brown & Henderson, Inc.,

138 vs.

Jewell-La Salle Realty Company, a Corporation.

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Gene Buck, as President of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, and Leo Feist, Inc.,
139 vs.
Jewell-La Salle Realty Company, a Corporation.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Jewell-La Salle Realty Company, a Corporation,
140 vs.
Gene Buck, as President of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, and Leo Feist, Inc.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that Question II must be answered in the affirmative, and that Question III must be answered in the affirmative subject to the limitation indicated in the opinion. As to Question IV, the certificate is dismissed.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The First National Bank of Chicago, a National Banking Association,

Petitioner,

124 vs.

The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

129 vs.

Sybil Whitehouse.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Farbwerke Vormals Meister Lucius &
Bruning, Deutsche Gold & Silber Anstalt
Vorm., etc., et al., Petitioners,
179 vs.
Chemical Foundation, Inc.; E. I. Du
Pont De Nemours & Co., etc., et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Farbwerke Vormals Meister Lucius
& Bruning,
Petitioner,
180 vs.
E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co. and
Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of the
United States.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Deutsche Gold & Silber Scheide
Anstalt Vorm. Roessler,

Petitioner,

181 vs.

E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co. and
Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of
the United States.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Badische-Anilin & Soda-Fabrik,

Petitioner,

182 vs.

E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co. and
Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of
the United States.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of
the United States,

Petitioner,

271 vs.

The Chemical Foundation, Inc., and
E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property
Custodian,

Petitioner,

272 vs.

Farbwerke Vormals Meister Lucius &
Bruning, E. I. Du Pont De Nemours &
Co., and Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer
of the United States.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, Petitioner,

273 vs.

Deutsche Gold & Silber Scheide Anstalt Vorm. Roessler, E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co., and Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of the United States.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, Petitioner,

274 vs.

Badische Anilin & Soda-Fabrik, E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co., and Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of the United States.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Jack W. Hussey. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

342

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

A. James Eckert, Petitioner, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

351

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The United States of America, Complainant, vs. The State of Utah.

14, Original.

ORDER.

This cause having come on for hearing on the exceptions of the parties to the Report of the Special Master and on the briefs filed herein, it is ordered that a decree be entered dismissing the complaint of the United States so far as it relates to the beds of the portions of the Green, Grand and Colorado Rivers found to be navigable, and adjudging that title to such beds was vested in Utah on January 4, 1896, except so far as the United States may theretofore have made grants thereof; and also adjudging that, on that date, (except as to lands theretofore granted) title to the beds of the portions of the Colorado River and of the San Juan River, where these rivers are found to be non-navigable, was vested in the United States. The decree shall also contain the priviso above mentioned. Each party will pay its own costs, one-half of the expenses incurred by the Master, and one-half of the amount to be fixed by the Court as his compensation.

It is further ordered that the Government prepare a form of decree in accordance with the opinion of the Court and furnish a copy to the State of Utah within fifteen days; and within ten days after such submission, the draft decree, together with suggestions on behalf of the State of Utah, if any, will be submitted to the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. E. Herron, vs. Southern Pacific Company.

131

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the negative, and that the second question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Columbus & Greenville Railway
Company, et al.,
Appellants and Petitioners,
195 vs.
W. J. Miller, State Tax Collector for
the Use of the Mississippi Levee District.

Appeal from and on writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States,
Petitioner,
252 vs.
Artemus C. Wells, et al., Executors
of the Estate of John W. Wells.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Hannah M. Smith, Administratrix of the Estate of Owen P. Smith,

Petitioner,

315 vs.

Springdale Amusement Park, Limited; Paul M. Williams and Gerald Brown.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hans Rees' Sons, Inc.,

Appellant,

334 vs.

State of North Carolina on the Relation of Allen J. Maxwell, Commissioner of Revenue.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The State of Louisiana, Complainant,

8, Original. vs. DECREE.

The State of Mississippi, Defendant.

This cause coming on for hearing by this Court upon the report of Thomas G. Haight, Special Master appointed by this Court, and herein filed, and upon the exceptions filed herein by the State of Mississippi, defendant, to said report of the Special Master, including the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for a decree, and also upon all pleadings and exhibits thereto heretofore filed by both complainant and defendant, and also upon all depositions of witnesses and documentary and record evidence adduced, preferred, filed, and submitted both by complainant and defendant and upon all briefs of counsel both for complainant and defendant heretofore filed and submitted; and thereupon, on February 2nd, A D 1931, this Court having rendered an opinion sustaining all the findings and recommendations of the Special Master, and directing that a decree should be entered as recommended by the Special Master; and the Court being fully advised in the premises:

It is thereupon considered, and now ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court, as follows, to wit:—

1. That the bill of complaint has been sustained by sufficient and legal evidence, and that complainant, the State of Louisiana, is at law and in equity entitled to the relief prayed for.

2. That the report of Thomas G. Haight, Special Master, be and the same is hereby approved, sustained, and confirmed by this Court, and that the exceptions to said report filed by the State of Mississippi be and the same are hereby overruled.

3. That immediately prior to the avulsion of 1912-1913 the boundary line between the State of Louisiana and the State of Mississippi between latitude 32° 39′ on the North and the division line between Issaquena and Warren Counties, Mississippi, (as extended westward), on the South, was at the place and line which was the thread of the main channel of the Mississippi River as it then ran; and that, the current having since ceased to flow in part of said channel as it existed prior to said avulsion, because of the new channel produced thereby, at this time the true boundary line between the State of Louisiana and the State of Mississippi, in that part and so much of the above area as was affected by the avulsion (between said North and South points), is the middle of the navigable channel of the Mississippi River as said channel was located at the time when the current ceased to flow therein because of the new channel produced by the avulsion of 1912-1913.

4. That Samuel S. Gannett, geodetic and astronomic engineer, of Washington, D. C., is hereby named and appointed as commissioner, with power, authority and instructions to run, locate, plat, and mark by suitable permanent boundary markers said boundary line, as above defined, by the use of the most accurate method now known to science and applicable in that locality, between said States between said North and South points, and to make and file in this Court as soon as practicable a full and accurate report of his findings, survey, and plat, and that the same be submitted to this Court for confirmation. And he shall file with his report the field notes of his survey, showing the method used by him in ascertaining and locating the line of the boundary, and a map showing the boundary line as run and marked by him; also 10 copies of his report and map. Said line when ascertained and located in accordance with this decree and approved and confirmed by the Court, is the boundary line between the State of Louisiana and the State of Mississippi between the North and South points hereinabove mentioned.

5. Before entering upon his work the commissioner shall take and subscribe his oath to perform his duties faithfully and impartially. He shall prosecute the work with diligence and despatch, and shall have authority to employ such assistants as may be needed therein; and he shall include in his report a statement

6. The work of the commissioner shall be subject in all its parts to the approval of the Court. One copy each of the commissioner's report and map shall be promptly transmitted by the clerk to the Governors of the two States; and exceptions or objections to the commissioner's report, if there be such, shall be presented to the Court, or, if it be not in session, filed with the clerk, within forty days after the report is filed.

7. That the sum to be allowed the commissioner hereby appointed, in payment of his services and reimbursement of his expenses, shall be fixed and allowed after the submission to this Court and confirmation by it of his report, findings, survey and plat.

8. If, for any reason, there occurs a vacancy in the commission when the Court is not in session, the same may be filed by the designation of a new commissioner by the Chief Justice.

9. That there is allowed and awarded to Thomas G. Haight, Special Master, the sum of $2500 for services performed as such Special Master, and the sum of $281.56 for expenditures and disbursements by him as such Special Master in the performance of his duties.

10. That all costs incurred in this suit by both complainant and defendant to and including the date of the rendition of this decree be and the same are hereby taxed and charged against the defendant, State of Mississippi, and are ordered and decreed to be paid by the State of Mississippi; that the costs and expenses that may hereafter be incurred and allowed by this Court in the ascertaining, marking, surveying and platting of the interstate boundary line by the commissioner, in pursuance of this decree, be and the same are hereby ordered and decreed to be paid one-half by complainant and one-half by defendant.

By the Court:

State of Connecticut,

Complainant,

12, Original. vs.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Upon consideration of the suggestions of the parties and the statement of Charles W. Bunn, Special Master, filed with the Clerk herein, the Court fixes his compensation at $12,000.00 and allows the expenses incurred by him, $1,135.88, all to be taxed as costs in the cause and to be paid one-half by each party.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Plaintiff,

22, Original. vs. O R D E R.

The State of Oregon.

On consideration of the motion by the United States for the appointment of a Special Master to take the evidence in this case and report the same to this Court with his findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for a decree,

It is now here ordered that Garret W. McEnerney, of San Francisco, State of California, be, and he is hereby, appointed a Special Master with the powers of a Master in Chancery, as provided in the rules of this Court, to take the evidence viva voce or by deposition and to report the same to the Court with his findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendation for a decree - all subject to examination, consideration, approval, modification, or other disposal by the Court.

The Special Master shall have authority (1) to employ competent stenographic and clerical assistants, (2) to fix the times and places of taking the evidence and to limit the time within which each party shall present its evidence, and (3)to issue subpoenas to secure the attendance of witnesses and to administer oaths. Depositions of witnesses residing at any place may be taken upon stipulation of the parties, or by the mode provided in the Rules of Practice for the Courts of Equity of the United States, or as provided by Sections 863, 865-7 of the Revised Statutes for the taking of depositions de bene esse in the District Courts, or as may be directed by the Master. They may be returned in the first instance to the Master. When the Special Master's report of his findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for a decree is completed the Clerk of the Court shall cause the same to be printed; and when the same is presented to the Court in printed form the parties will be accorded a reasonable time, to be fixed by the Court, within which the present exceptions. The Special Master shall be allowed his actual expenses and a reasonable compensation for his services to be fixed hereafter by the Court. The allowances to him, the compensation paid to his stenographic and clerical assistants, and the cost of printing his report shall be charged against and borne by the parties in such proportions as the Court may hereafter direct.

If the appointment herein made of a Special Master is not accepted, or if the place becomes vacant during the recess of the Court, the Chief Justice shall have authority to make a new designation which shall have the same effect as if originally made by the Court herein.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Carbice Corporation of America,
Petitioner,
54 vs.
American Patents Development Corporation, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a rehearing filed in this case,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition for rehearing be, and the same is hereby, granted, but limited to the question of the validity of patent No. 1,595,426, and the case is assigned for argument on Monday, April 27 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Liberty Central Trust Company, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
698 vs.
Greenbrier College for Women.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted, the case is placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, April 27 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.
Ex Parte: Frank L. Smith, Cicero J. Lindly, Hal W. Trovillion, et al.,
Petitioners.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States ex rel. Empire & Southeastern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
728 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad
Company,
Petitioner,
737 vs.
R. F. Highfill.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Simons Brick Company,
Petitioner,
747 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Crider Brothers Commission Company,
Petitioner,
755 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Rogers & Hubbard,

Petitioner,

784 vs.

Hartford & New York Transportation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Rogers & Hubbard,

Petitioner,

785 vs.

Hartford & New York Transportation Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David W. Phillips, Collector of Internal Revenue,

721 vs.

Dime Trust and Safe Deposit Company, etc.

The joint motion to bring up the entire record and cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in that behalf.

Ector O. Munn,
Petitioner,
817 - vs.
Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The death of Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue, and the qualification of Frank Collis Bowers as executor of the estate of the said Frank K. Bowers, having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher now here ordered by the Court that Frank Collis Bowers, as executor of the estate of Frank K. Bowers, be, and he is hereby, substituted and made the party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Annie C. Phillips, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
455 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Oscar R. Ewing, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of South Penn Oil Company, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company,
Appellant,
470 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California, et al.;
Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company,
Appellant,
471 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California, et al.;
Southern Pacific Company, et al.
Appellants,
472 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Edwin C. Blanchard, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the City of Los Angeles, as amicus curiae, in these causes.

—, Original.
Ex parte: Madden Bros., Inc.,
Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Abbot P. Mills in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

The Maytag Company,
Petitioner,
831 vs.
The Meadows Manufacturing Company.

The motion for leave to file brief of Henry M. Huxley, as amicus curiae herein, was submitted by Mr. William S. Hodges, and the motion denied.

Duquesne Steel Foundry Company,
Petitioner,
457 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. William Cogger, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Moody & Waters Company, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

W. J. McCahan Sugar Refining and Molasses Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
582 vs.
Augustus P. Norton, Deputy Commissioner, etc.

The motion for counsel fees in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mortimer W. H. Cox in that behalf.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
563 vs.
Delmar Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Nelson Thomas, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Smoot Sand and Gravel Corporation,
Petitioner,
678 vs.
Washington Airport, Inc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Edwin H. Gibson, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Commonwealth of Virginia, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Burley Adams, Appellant, 837 vs. James B. Park, Judge of the Superior Court of Ocmulgee Circuit.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin E. Pierce for the appellant.
Arthur Meyers, Appellant, 838 vs. M. C. Whittle, Sheriff of Richmond County, Georgia.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin E. Pierce for the appellant.
Fred Strang, Petitioner, 859 vs. The United States of America.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles T. Rowland for the petitioner.
Thomas L. Wolfe, Grace C. Wolfe, et al., Appellants, 624 vs. Patrick J. Hurley, Secretary of War, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles F. Borah and Mr. Hugh Tullis for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the appellee, in opposition thereto.
Albert A. Hoeper, Appellant, 714 vs. Tax Commission of Wisconsin, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claire B. Bird for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. John W. Reynolds and Mr. Harold M. Wilkie for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

Burley Adams, Appellant, vs. James B. Park, Judge, etc. 837	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin E. Pierce for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. George M. Napier and Mr. T. R. Gress for the appellee in opposition thereto.
Arthur Meyers, Appellant, vs. M. C. Whittle, Sheriff, etc. 838	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin E. Pierce for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. George M. Napier and Mr. T. R. Gress for the appellee in opposition thereto.
DeLaval Steam Turbine Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 685	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Flannery, Mr. George C. Holton, Mr. Frank F. Nesbit, and Mr. George F. Losche for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.
The Ship Construction & Trading Co., Inc., Petitioner, vs. The United States. 695	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Hayne deYampert for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. William W. Scott for the respondent.

Congressional Country Club,
Petitioner,
696 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, Mr. Benjamin B. Pettus, and Mr. H. B. McCawley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. R. C. Williamson, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Wilton Lloyd-Smith, Receiver, etc.,
Petitioner,
699 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George R. Shields for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Charles R. Pollard, Mr. H. Brian Holland, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Bankers Reserve Life Company,
Petitioner,
738 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. K. Shipe and Mr. Charles Kerr for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

West Disinfecting Company,
Petitioner,
750 vs.
United States Paper Mills, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Clarkson Seward for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clarence B. Des Jardins, Mr. Herbert J. Jacobi, and Mr. William J. Jacobi for the respondent.

The Moffat Tunnel Improvement District, etc., et al., Petitioners, 751 vs. The Denver and Salt Lake Railway Company; The Moffat Tunnel Improvement District, etc., et al., Petitioners, 752 vs. The Denver and Salt Lake Railway Company.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace N. Hawkins, Mr. Norton Montgomery, and Mr. Erskin R. Myer, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gerald Hughes, Mr. Clayton C. Dorsey, and Mr. Elmer L. Brock for the respondent.
Abraham J. Weinstein, doing business under the trade name of Weinstein Brothers, Petitioner, 757 vs. Black Diamond Steamship Corporation, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank I. Finkler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. J. Frank Staley for the respondent.
Greater New York Life Poultry Chamber of Commerce, et al., Petitioners, 758 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Dickerman Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.
The United States, Petitioner, 759 vs. Kirby Lumber Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert Ash for the respondent.

Roberts K. Skinner, et al.,
Petitioners,
761 vs.
Robert O. Eaton, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. F. Donaghoe for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. G. Divet, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company,
Petitioner,
763 vs.
Frank P. McComb.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeals, First Appellate District, State of California, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert O. Brennan, Mr. E. E. McInnis, and Mr. Edward W. Camp for the petitioner, and by Mr. James F. Brennan for the respondent.

The Delaware Bay and River Pilots' Association,
Petitioner,
764 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto Wolff, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Grand Trunk Western Railway Company,
Petitioner,
766 vs.
Stanley Pipal.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis L. Dent and Mr. Charles Y. Freeman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph D. Ryan for the respondent.

Jacob Sokol,
Petitioner,
767 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Max V. Schoonmaker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, Mr. F. Cadmus Damrell, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Thirty-first Infantry Post Exchange, et al.,
Petitioners,
768 vs.
Juan Posadas, Jr., Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur W. Brown and Mr. Mark E. Guerin for the petitioners, and by Mr. James S. Easby-Smith and Mr. Francis W. Hill, Jr., for the respondent.

Morris-Cumings Dredging Company,
Petitioner,
769 vs.
Henry Steers, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leonard J. Matteson for the petitioner, and by Mr. William F. Purdy for the respondent.

Dr. William Quitt, Individually, etc.,
Petitioner,
770 vs.
Thomas E. Stone, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph A. Cantrel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondents.

Alexander Davidoff,
Petitioner,
771 vs.
Thomas A. Edison, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Borris M. Komar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roger Hinds for the respondent.

National Tank & Export Company,
Petitioner,
772 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eliot C. Lovett and Mr. Elisha Hanson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Norman D. Keller, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr. for the respondent.

Wm. H. Moore, Jr., Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
773 vs.
O. S. Bay.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles F. Hutchins for the petitioner.

James W. Hubbell, as Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
774 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
Grover C. Hubbell, Petitioner,
775 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
Beulah C. Wacktmeister, Petitioner,
776 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
F. C. Hubbell, Petitioner,
777 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. C. Gamble for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John Henry McEvers, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Frank Dial, Petitioner,
778 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Dial, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Louis R. Mehlinger for the respondent.

Sun Insurance Office, Petitioner,
779 vs.
J. M. Scott;
Norwich Union Fire Insurance Society, Ltd., Petitioner,
780 vs.
J. M. Scott;
The Home Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner,
781 vs.
J. M. Scott.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rolland M. Edmonds for the petitioners, and by Mr. Elwood Murphy and Mr. F. S. Monnett for the respondent.

Al-Gene P. Conrad, Petitioner,
782 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lovick P. Miles for the petitioner, and by Mr. Earl King, Mr. Caruthers Ewing, and Mr. Louis H. Cooke for the respondent.

Mabel Rupert, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
783 vs.
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Very Quarles for the petitioner, and by Mr. O. W. Dynes, Mr. Rodger Murphy Trump, Mr. C. S. Jefferson, and Mr. Walter Bender for the respondent.

Agnes McCarry, General Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
788 vs.
The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Lane and Mr. Clement K. Corbin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin F. Smith and Mr. Charles E. Miller for the respondent.

Miami Valley Fruit Company, et al., Petitioners,
789 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John R. L. Smith for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key and Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe for the respondent.

William H. Mecon, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
790 vs.
Fitzsimmons Drilling Company, Inc., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. J. Montgomery for the petitioner, and by Mr. George F. Short, Mr. Horace H. Hagan, Mr. Hal C. Thurman, Mr. Ray S. Fellows, and Mr. Thomas R. Freeman for the respondents.

Julia Biernacki, as Administrator, etc. Petitioner,
791 vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sydney A. Syme for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper and Mr. Morton L. Fearey for the respondent.

Norman S. Bowles, Petitioner,
792 vs.
Bolitha J. Laws, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Morris Wampler for the petitioner.

Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
797 vs.
William Kuhn;
Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
798 vs.
William Kuhn.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio and to the Court of Appeals of Pike County, State of Ohio, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David H. Leake and Mr. Henry Bannon for the petitioner, and by Mr. George D. Nye for the respondent.

Charles D. Jaffee, Petitioner,
799 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner, etc.;
Louis J. Jaffee, Petitioner,
800 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner, etc.;
Julius Schwartz, Petitioner,
801 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner, etc.;
Harry H. Schwartz, Petitioner,
802 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner, etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harvey L. Rabbitt and Mr. Harry T. Lore for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John C. Remey, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

James W. Alker, et al., etc., Petitioners,
803 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Karl Knox Gartner for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. William Cutler Thompson, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Detroit, Toledo & Ironton Railroad Company, Petitioner, 808 vs. John T. Hahn.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifford B. Longley and Mr. Wallace R. Middleton for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. B. Newcomb for the respondent.
Jones Engineering and Construction Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners, 812 vs. Lambert Lumber Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Harding, Mr. David A. Murphy, and Mr. Edward S. Bailey for the petitioners, and by Mr. Harris L. Moore for the respondent.
Margaret C. Staley, et al., Petitioners, 814 vs. David Espenlaub, et al., etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Simeon A. Handy for the petitioners, and by Mr. Howard F. Bresee for the respondents.
The Maytag Company, Petitioner, 831 vs. The Meadows Manufacturing Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wallace R. Lane, Mr. Edward S. Rogers, and Mr. William J. Hughes, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hal M. Stone for the respondent.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, Mr. Maurice D. Green, Mr. C. C. Hine, and Mr. Charles S. Burg for the petitioner and by Mr. Karl Knox Gartner for the respondent.
847 vs.	
Consolidated Cut Stone Company.	
The State of New Jersey, Complainant,	Six and one-quarter hours allowed for the argument of this case. The argume on the exceptions to the report of the special master was commenced by Mr. Duane E. Minard for the complainant.
16, Original. vs.	
The State of New York and the City of New York.	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles E. Riordon, It is ordered that Paul B. Hunter, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles M. Galloway, It is ordered that Allan C. Bakewell, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hampson Gary, It is ordered that Rosser J. Coke, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hampson Gary, It is ordered that Wm. H. Clark, Jr., Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ulpiano Crespo, Jr., It is ordered that Vincente Zayas, Esquire, of Ponce, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jacob Halper, It is ordered that Maurice M. Grudd, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Lamar, It is ordered that Charles Henry Fleming, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Appleman, It is ordered that Alfred E. Roth, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert C. Simmons, It is ordered that Harold W. Sullivan, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Walsh, It is ordered that Joe Ewing Estes, Esquire, of Ft. Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elton L. Marshall, It is ordered that Lucien Aubrey Warden, Esquire, of Trenton, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert G. Simmons, It is ordered that James G. Mothersead, Esquire, of Scottsbluff, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert G. Simmons, It is ordered that Thomas N. Foynes, Esquire, of Melrose, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert G. Simmons, It is ordered that Floyd E. Wright, Esquire, of Scottsbluff, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Northcutt Ely, It is ordered that John D. Richer, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
vs.
16, Original.
The State of New York and the City of New York.

The argument on the exceptions to the report of the Special Master in this case was continued by Mr. Duane N. Minard for the complainant; by Mr. Thomas Penney, Jr., for the defendant, State of New York; by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly, for the defendant, the City of New York; and by Mr. George G. Chandler for the intervener, the State of Pennsylvania.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis VanDevanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Price, It is ordered that W. Braxton Dew, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence J. Heller, It is ordered that Calman Mayer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
16, Original. vs.
The State of New York and the City of New York.

The argument on the exceptions to the report of the Special Master in this case was concluded by Mr. James M. Beck for the complainant.

Ramsey & Catlin Construction Company and Aetna Casualty & Surety Company,
94 vs.
Vincennes Bridge Company.

This case was argued by Mr. W. Braxton Dew for Ramsey & Catlin Construction Company, et al., and by Mr. Frank C. Malin for the Vincennes Bridge Company.

Yetta Stromberg,
Appellant,
584 vs.
The People of the State of California.

This case was argued by Mr. John Beardsley for the appellant, and by Mr. John D. Richer for the appellee.

The United States of America, ex rel. Ethel M. McLennan, Petitioner,
618 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior;
The United States of America, ex rel. H. H. Simpson, Petitioner,
676 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, et al.;
The United States of America, ex rel. Roy G. Barton, Petitioner,
704 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior;
The United States of America, ex rel. W. B. Pyron, Petitioner,
743 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

Three and one-half hours allowed for the argument of these cases. The argument commenced by Mr. Lewis Edwin Hoffman for the petitioner in No. 618.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard S. Doyle, It is ordered that Millard F. Tompkins, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Houston Merrill, It is ordered that Geo. A. Mathers, Esquire, of Bennington, State of Vermont, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene R. West, It is ordered that Henry G. Molina, Esquire, of Rye, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward Staff It is ordered that Frank Michels, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Stanley Hinrichs, It is ordered that LeRoy B. Iserman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg, It is ordered that John W. Heller, III, Esquire, of York, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson, It is ordered that O. Leland Hunt, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America, ex rel. Ethel M. McLennan, Petitioner,
618 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior;
The United States of America, ex rel. H. H. Simpson, Petitioner,
676 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, et al.;
The United States of America, ex rel. Roy G. Barton, Petitioner,
704 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior;
The United States of America, ex rel. W. B. Pyron, Petitioner,
743 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Lewis Edwin Hoffman for the petitioner in No. 618; by Mr. Homer R. Hendricks for the petitioner in No. 676; by Mr. James Conlon for the petitioner in No. 704; by Mr. James G. Leovy for the petitioner in No. 743; by Mr. James A. Greenwood for the State of Wyoming and Mr. Clarence L. Ireland for the State of Colorado as amici curiae, by special leave of Court; by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the respondents; and concluded by Mr. Chester I. Long for the petitioner in No. 618.

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1931 - CONTINUED

Walter O. Fetters, U. S. Marshal, etc., Petitioner, vs. The United States of America, ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham.	This case was argued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner and by Mr. huby R. Vale for the respondent.
720	
Guy Spurrier and Gerata Cella Spurrier, Appellants, vs. Mitchell Irrigation District and Gering & Ft. Laramie Irrigation District.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. M. Fitzgerald for the appellants.
306	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, It is ordered that Erwin E. Richter, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fontaine C. Bradley, It is ordered that Robert H. Hopkins, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Marsh, It is ordered that Robert Hale, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Guy Spurrier and Gerat Cella Spurrier,
Appellants,
306 vs.
Mitchell Irrigation District and Gering & Ft. Laramie Irrigation District.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. J. M. FitzGerald for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Smoot Sand and Gravel Corporation,
Petitioner,
678 vs.
Washington Airport, Incorporated.

This case was argued by Mr. Thomas D. Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Titus for the respondent.

Gasoline Products Company, Inc.,
Petitioners,
362 vs.
Champlin Refining Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John B. Marsh for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Horace G. McKeever for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Robert Hale for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made, the Court is adjourned until Monday next at ten o'clock a.m.

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Preston Swecker, It is ordered that J. Howard Flint, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dean G. Acheson, It is ordered that Raymond B. Goodell, Esquire, of Salem, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Max Thelan, It is ordered that Milton Bryan, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that H. E. Carter, Esquire, of Tallahassee, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Geo. A. Keyser, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Israel B. Oseas, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, It is ordered that Harrison Fargo McConnell, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Paul Earnest, It is ordered that Arthur Vincent McKee, Esquire, of Butler, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elton L. Marshall, It is ordered that Denton Dunn, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Joseph B. Straton, Raymond Fleshman,
and Randolph Bias, Special Commissioners of the Circuit Court of Mingo County, West Virginia,
137 vs.
Andy New, Jr., Trustee in Bankruptcy of Fall Branch Coal Company, et al.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

State-Planters Bank and Trust Company,
J. Jordan Leake and A. S. Buford, etc.,
et al.,
166 vs.
T. Nelson Parker, Ellsworth Wiltshire and M. Pope Taylor, Trustees, etc.,
et al.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the certificate in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Alfred Scott Aldridge, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

683

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

—, Original. Ex Parte: Madden Brothers, Inc., Petitioner. — On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus, and of the petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is now here ordered by this Court that a rule issue to the Honorable Joseph W. Molyneaux, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota, returnable on Monday, May 18, 1931, to show cause why a writ of mandamus should not issue to him in accordance with the prayer of the petition.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. J. McCahan Sugar Refining and Molasses Company, et al., Petitioners,
582 vs.
Augustus P. Norton, Deputy Commissioner, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion for counsel fees herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to an application to the District Court.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David W. Phillips, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
721 vs.
Dime Trust & Safe Deposit Company, Executor, etc.

On consideration of the joint motion to bring up the entire record and cause herein,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thomas L. Wolfe, et al., Appellants,
624 vs.
Patrick J. Hurley, Secretary of War, et al.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this cause be postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.
And it is further ordered that the motion to advance this cause be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is assigned for argument on Friday, May 1, next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Albert A. Hooper, Appellant,
714 vs.
Tax Commission of Wisconsin, et al.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court be postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Burley Adams,

Appellant,

837 vs.

James B. Park, Judge of the Superior Courts of Ocmulgee Circuit.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the Special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Burley Adams,

Appellant,

837 vs.

James B. Park, Judge of the Superior Courts of Ocmulgee Circuit.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arthur Meyers,

Appellant,

838 vs.

M. G. Whittle, Sheriff of Richmond County, Georgia.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the Special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arthur Meyers,

Appellant,

838 vs.

M. G.Whittle, Sheriff of Richmond County, Georgia.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fred Strang,

Petitioner,

859 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fred Strang,

Petitioner,

859 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ramsey & Catlin Construction Company and Aetna Casualty & Surety Company,
94 vs.
Vincennes Bridge Company.

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the certificate in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Guy Spurrier and Gerata Cella Spurrier,
Appellants,
306 vs.
Mitchell Irrigation District and Gering and Ft. Laramie Irrigation District.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Guy Spurrier and Gerata Cella Spurrier,
Appellants,
306 vs.
Mitchell Irrigation District and Gering and Ft. Laramie Irrigation District.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska as an application for a writ of certiorari.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

DeLaval Steam Turbine Company, Petitioner,
685 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States, Petitioner,
759 vs.
Kirby Lumber Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wm. H. Moore, Jr., Trustee in Bankruptcy for the Estate of Sassard & Kimball, Inc., Bankrupt, Petitioner,
773 vs.
O. S. Bay.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sun Insurance Office, Petitioner,
779 vs.
J. M. Scott.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Norwich Union Fire Insurance Society, Ltd., Petitioner,
780 vs.
J. M. Scott.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Home Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner,
781 vs.
J. M. Scott.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William H. Mecon, Administrator of the Estate of Archie Lee Smith, Deceased, Petitioner,
790 vs.
Fitzsimmons Drilling Company, Inc., and Atlantic Oil Producing Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
797 vs.
William Kuhn.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
798 vs.
William Kuhn.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Pike County, State of Ohio is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
745 vs.
William L. Nevin, Executor of the Estate of John Wanamaker.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Ship Construction & Trading Co.,
Inc., Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
695 vs. to the Court of Claims.
The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein t the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Congressional Country Club,
Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
696 vs. to the Court of Claims.
The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wilton Lloyd-Smith, Receiver for
Willys Corporation,
Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
699 vs. to the Court of Claims.
The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bankers Reserve Life Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

738 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

West Disinfecting Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

750 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

United States Paper Mills, Inc., of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

and Courtney P. Winter.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Moffat Tunnel Improvement District,

etc., et al.,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

751 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

The Denver and Salt Lake Railway. of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Moffat Tunnel Improvement
District, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
752 vs.
The Denver and Salt Lake Railway
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Abraham J. Weinstein, doing business
under the trade name of Weinstein
Brothers,
Petitioner,
757 vs.
Black Diamond Steamship Corporation,
sued herein with United States Shipping
Board Merchant Fleet Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Greater New York Live Poultry
Chamber of Commerce, et al.,
Petitioners,
758 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Roberts K. Skinner, William C. Skinner, Jr., and Leon P. Broadhurst, etc., Petitioners, vs. Robert O. Eaton, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Connecticut. 761

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Frank P. McComb. 763

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District, State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, 1st Appeallate District, State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Delaware Bay and River Pilot's Association, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 764

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Grand Trunk Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
766 vs.
Stanley Pipal.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jacob Sokol, Petitioner,
767 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thirty-first Infantry Post Exchange, et al., Petitioners,
768 vs.
Juan Posadas, Jr., Collector of Internal Revenue, Philippine Islands.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Morris & Cumings Dredging Company, Petitioner, vs. Henry Steers, Inc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

769

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dr. William Quitt, Individually and Trading as Three Flower Chemical Company, Petitioner, vs. Thomas E. Stone, Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

770

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alexander Davidoff, Petitioner, vs. Thomas A. Edison, Incorporated. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

771

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

National Tank & Export Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

772

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James W. Hubbell, as Administrator of the Estate of Frederick M. Hubbell, Deceased, Petitioner, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

774

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Grover C. Hubbell, Petitioner, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

775

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Beulah C. Wachtmeister,

Petitioner,

776 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

F. C. Hubbell,

Petitioner,

777 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank Dial,

Petitioner,

778 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Al-Gene P. Conrad, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
to the United States Circuit Court
782 vs. of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.
New York Life Insurance Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mabel Rupert, as Administratrix of
the Estate of Arba Rupert, Deceased,
Intestate, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
783 vs. to the Supreme Court of the
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & State of Wisconsin.
Pacific Railroad Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Agnes McCarry, General Administratrix
of the Estate of John McCarry,
Deceased, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
788 vs. to the Court of Errors and Appeals
The Central Railroad Company of of the State of New Jersey.
New Jersey.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Miami Valley Fruit Company, Albert J. Evans and Joseph E. Davidson, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 789

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Julia Biernacki, as Administratrix of the Goods, Chattels, Rights and Credits which were of Michael Biernacki, Deceased, Petitioner, vs. The Pennsylvania Railroad Company. 791

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Norman S. Bowles, Petitioner, vs. Bolitha J. Laws, C. F. R. Ogilby and Lucien H. Vandoren. 792

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James W. Alker, Henry A. Alker, Edward P. Alker, Executors of the Estate of Florence A. Alker, Deceased, Petitioners,

803 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Detroit, Toledo & Ironton Railroad Company, Petitioner,

808 vs.

John T. Hahn.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jones Engineering and Construction Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners,

812 vs.

Lambert Lumber Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Margaret C. Staley, Mattie J. Snyder,
Lillian B. Bloom, et al.,
Petitioners,
814 vs.
David Espenlaub, Samuel Clarke and
Peter Kramer, Commissioners of
Wyandotte County, Kansas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Maytag Company,
Petitioner,
831 vs.
The Meadows Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe
Railway Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
847 vs.
Consolidated Cut Stone Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order of the Court:

ORDER.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the call of the docket be suspended for the term on Friday, May 1st next, and that the Court will take a recess from Monday, May 4th until Monday, May 18th next.

It is further ordered by this Court that no petitions for writs of certiorari or other motions, except motions for admission to practice, will be received after Monday, May 25th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Samuel B. Field and Joseph S. Pruitt, Appellants,
— vs.
James T. Powell and John S. Daisy.

The petition for appeal herein and the motion to substitute Nellie Field Burwell, sole devisee of Samuel B. Field, as a party appellant were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Christopher B. Garnett in behalf of counsel.

The Texas and Pacific Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
744 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The motion to make the Louisiana Public Service Commission a party appellant herein, and the motion to advance this case were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert L. W. Thompson in that behalf.

May Norwood and Carlisle Norwood, Appellants,
748 vs.
John J. Bennett, Jr., Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., etc.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash in behalf of counsel for the appellants.

B. M. Goldman,

Appellant,

895 vs.

M. B. Korman.

Appeal from the Superior Court, Los Angeles County, State of California.

Israel J. Mendelson, Esquire, of counsel for the appellee, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to wit:

"In the Appellate Department of the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Los Angeles

M. B. Korman,

Plaintiff and Appellee,)

vs.) No. C. A. 321.

B. M. Goldman,) Certificate of Clerk of Court.

Defendant and Appellant.)

L. E. Lampton, Clerk of the Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and Ex-Officio Clerk of the Appellate Department of the Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, does hereby certify as follows:

That on the 7th day of January, 1931, an appeal was duly allowed in the above entitled cause from the Appellate Department of the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Los Angeles to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In Witness Whereof, I have caused the Seal of said Court to be hereunto affixed at the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, State of California, this 7th day of April, 1931.

(Seal)

L. E. Lampton, County Clerk,
by J. F. Rice, Deputy."

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the 11th Rule.

And it appearing to the court that the appellant has failed to have his cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Superior Court, Los Angeles County, State of California, to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

May Norwood and Carlisle Norwood, Appellants,
748 vs.
John J. Bennett, Jr., Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sidney S. Bobbe for the appellants.

City of Chicago, Appellant,
753 vs.
Chicago Rapid Transit Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel A. Ettleson, Mr. Albert H. Veeder, and Mr. Edward C. Higgins for the appellant.

Magno Santovincenzo, Consul of the Kingdom of Italy, at New York, Appellant,
787 vs.
James F. Egan, Public Administrator, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carroll G. Walter for the appellant.

Dunbar & Sullivan Dredging Company, Petitioner,
739 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dana B. Hellings for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. P. M. Cox, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Frank Dial, Petitioner,
762 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Dial, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. F. Mothershead, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

The Employers' Liability Assurance Corporation, Limited, Petitioner, 794 vs. Irving A. Durkee.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. C. Sloss for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. M. Chamberlin for the respondent.
The Employers' Liability Assurance Corporation, Limited, Petitioner, 795 vs. Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District, State of California, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. C. Sloss for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. M. Chamberlin for the respondents.
The Employers' Liability Assurance Corporation, Limited, Petitioner, 796 vs. Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. C. Sloss for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. M. Chamberlin for the respondents.
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner, 806 vs. J. H. Hardy, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 9th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wilmer S. Hunt for the petitioner.

The Reading Company, Petitioner,
809 vs.
John Geary.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander Armstrong and Mr. Eugene S. Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Saul Praeger, Mr. Roszel C. Thomsen, and Mr. Walter L. Clark for the respondent.

Joy Chemical Company, Petitioner,
810 vs.
William D. Moss, Supervisor of Permits, etc., et al.;
Isidor Selkow, trading as Washington Barber Supply Company, Petitioner,
811 vs.
Maurice Campbell, former Federal Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Dickerman Williams and Mr. John Fletcher Caskey for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Keifer, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

First National Bank in Dallas, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
816 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rhodes S. Baker and Mr. Alex. F. Weisberg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., Mr. C. M. Charest, and Mr. Prew Savoy for the respondent.

Ector O. Munn, Petitioner,
817 vs.
Frank Collis Bowers, Executor, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Livingston Platt, Mr. John G. Jackson, and Mr. Eli J. Blair for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Wm. Cutler Thompson, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Helene Walker King, Petitioner,
818 vs.
A. C. Alexander, Collector, etc.;
Helene Walker King, Petitioner,
819 vs.
A. C. Alexander, Collector, etc.;
Helene Walker King, Petitioner,
820 vs.
A. C. Alexander, Collector, etc.;
Anna Ruzek, Petitioner,
821 vs.
A. C. Alexander, Collector, etc.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry O. Glasser for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Hayner N. Larson, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

John Strong, Petitioner,
822 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Lewis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Lela Gaddis, et al.,
Petitioners,
824 vs.
Guy W. Junker, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 9th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. D. Gordon for the petitioners, and by Mr. Will E. Orgain for the respondents.

Bank of Italy,
Petitioner,
826 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph W. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. John Henry McEvers for the respondent.

First National Bank of Fresno, California,
Petitioner,
827 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph W. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
834 vs.
Grace M. O'Dell, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin D. Holt and Mr. E. A. Foote for the petitioner, and by Mr. John Ruffalo for the respondent.

C. W. Greene and Robert A. Meier, et al., Petitioners,
835 vs.
Joseph B. Uniacke.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George C. Bedell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Peter O. Knight and Mr. A. G. Turner for the respondent.

Radio Corporation of America, Petitioner,
888 vs.
DeForest Radio Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. Thurlow M. Gordon, Mr. Manton Davis, Mr. Stephen H. Philbin, and Mr. Porter R. Chandler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., for the respondent.

Western Land & Reclamation Company, Appellant,
290 vs.
The Reclamation Board of the State of California, et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. W. H. Metson for the appellant, and by Mr. Stephen W. Downey for the appellees.

W. W. Custer, Petitioner,
422 vs.
Bob B. McCutchen, Substituted for F. M. Breshears, deceased, United States Marshal, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. J. F. Nugent for the petitioner, and by Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the respondent.

Francisco Lopez Sanchez, Petitioner,
423 vs.
Antonia Cautier y Borras.

This case was argued by Mr. Nelson Gammans for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry G. Molina for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Shelby S. Faulkner, It is ordered that Timothy G. Histon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Swindler, It is ordered that Richard H. Wills, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore T. Golden, It is ordered that J. Ernest Isherwood, Esquire, of Waynesburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore T. Tolden, It is ordered that Samuel M. Smith, Esquire, of Waynesburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles V. Imlay, It is ordered that Charles J. Isber, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. U. Bon Geaslin, It is ordered that Robt. G. Stephens, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Williams, It is ordered that John L. Goodwyn, Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Brantley, It is ordered that Carl H. Davis, Esquire, of Wilmington, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Lewis-Simas-Jones Company,
Petitioner,
520 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Robert E. Quirk, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of American Cyanamid Company, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Merchants Warehouse Company, Appellant,
635 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;

Merchants Warehouse Company, et al., Appellants,
636 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
637 vs.
Merchants Warehouse Company, et al.;

The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Co., Appellant,
638 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;

The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, et al., Appellants,
639 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
640 vs.
The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company, et al.;

The Philadephia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, Appellant,
641 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;

Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al., Appellants,
642 vs.
The United States of America, et al.;

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
643 vs.
The Philadelphia Warehousing and Cold Storage Company, et al.

Three hours allowed for the oral argument of these cases. The argume
was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the Merchants Warehouse Company, et al
continued by Mr. John P. Connelly for the Pennsylvania Warehousing and Cold
Storage Company; by Mr. J. Stanley Payne for the United States of America and
the Interstate Commerce Commission; by Mr. John J. Hickey for James Gallagher
Northeast Warehouse Company, et al.; and concluded by Mr. John W. Davis for
Merchants Warehouse Company, et al.

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
426 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Company;

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
427 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Company;

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner,
428 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Company;

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
429 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Company;

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
430 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Company;

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner,
431 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Company;

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner,
432 vs.
Klein Chocolate Company;

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
433 vs.
Klein Chocolate Company;

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
434 vs.
Klein Chocolate Company;

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
435 vs.
Klein Chocolate Company;

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
436 vs.
Wilbur-Suchard Chocolate Company;

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
437 vs.
Wilbur-Suchard Chocolate Company;

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
438 vs.
Wilbur-Suchard Chocolate Company;

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner,
439 vs.
York Chocolate Company;

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
440 vs.
York Chocolate Company;

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
441 vs.
York Chocolate Company.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. William Clark Mason for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, It is ordered that Lowe P. Siddons, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gilbert Bettman, It is ordered that William B. Cockley, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thos. O. Marlar, It is ordered that Percy R. Taylor, Esquire, of Toledo, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elkan Turk, It is ordered that Daniel Eberstein, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Martin A. Morrison, It is ordered that Lewis W. McCandless, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Annie G. Phillips, et al., Petitioners,	On motion made to the Court by Mr. Richard H. Wills, in that behalf, leave
455 vs.	was granted to file brief of Mid-
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	Continent Petroleum Corporation, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
426 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Company;

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
427 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Company;

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner,
428 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Company;

Est. B. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
429 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Company;

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
430 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Company;

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner,
431 vs.
Hershey Chocolate Company;

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner,
432 vs.
Klein Chocolate Company;

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
433 vs.
Klein Chocolate Company;

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
434 vs.
Klein Chocolate Company;

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
435 vs.
Klein Chocolate Company;

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
436 vs.
Wilbur-Suchard Chocolate Company;

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
437 vs.
Wilbur-Suchard Chocolate Company;

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
438 vs.
Wilbur-Suchard Chocolate Company;

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner,
439 vs.
York Chocolate Company;

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
440 vs.
York Chocolate Company;

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner,
441 vs.
York Chocolate Company.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. William Clarke Mason for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioners.

Floy P. Baldwin,
Petitioner,
445 vs.
Iowa State Traveling Men's Association.

This case was argued by Mr. Denton Dunn for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. M. Parsons for the respondent.

E. S. Smith,
Appellant,
449 vs.
W. B. Cahoon, Sheriff of Duval County, Florida.

This case was argued by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellant, and by Mr. H. E. Carter for the appellee.

The East Ohio Gas Company,
Appellant,
453 vs.
The Tax Commission of Ohio, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William B. Cockley for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Gilbert Bettman for the appellees.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lewis W. McCandless, It is ordered that Rockwell T. Gust, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that H. Linwood Godfrey, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred C. Rector, It is ordered that Richard T. Rector, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, It is ordered that Lewis Jones, Esquire, of Brigham, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. Leo Ruslander, It is ordered that Samuel Kaufman, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The East Ohio Gas Company,
Appellant,
453 vs.
The Tax Commission of Ohio, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Gilbert Bettman for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. William B. Cockley for the appellant.

Annie G. Phillips, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
455 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

This case was argued by Mr. Elkan Turk for the petitioners, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.

Duquesne Steel Foundry Company,
Petitioner,
457 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

This case was argued by Mr. William S. Moorhead for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

Enameled Metals Company,
Petitioner,
489 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

This case was argued by Mr. S. Leo Ruslander and Mr. Clarence N. Goodwin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Appellant,

470 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, et al.;

Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company, Appellant,

471 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California, et al.;

Southern Pacific Company, et al., Appellants,

472 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. C. W. Durbrow for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, APRIL 24, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Prew Savoy, It is ordered that Walter Leichter, Esquire, of Union City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vernon E. Hodges, It is ordered that Daniel Burke, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John G. Palfrey, It is ordered that W. Barton Leach, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carroll L. Beedy, It is ordered that Frank H. Purinton, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Appellant,

470 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California;

Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company, Appellant,

471 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California;

Southern Pacific Company, et al., Appellants,

472 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. C. W. Durbrow for the appellants, by Mr. Arthur T. George for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. C. W. Durbrow for the appellants.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,

484 vs.

Raladam Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lewis W. McCandless for the respondent.

Frank L. Young Company, Petitioner,

490 vs.

McNeal-Edwards Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Walter B. Leach for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ward Loveless, It is ordered that Frank Hormuth, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Wells, It is ordered that Ellis D. Bever, Esquire, of Independence, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nat M. Lacy, It is ordered that Gilbert Lamb, Esquire, of Salisbury, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., It is ordered that Walter A. Darby, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas E. Knight, Jr., It is ordered that Albert A. Carmichael, Esquire, of Montgomery, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur Monroe Free, It is ordered that Wm. P. James, Esquire, of San Jose, State of Californi be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Thomas Dunlop, It is ordered that Leo C. Fennelly, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Riley Andrew Blessing, It is ordered that W. Elliott Nefflen, Esquire, of Keyser, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Davis, It is ordered that Haymond Maxwell, Esquire, of Clarksburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Nellie Field Burwell, Sole Devisee and Executrix of Samuel B. Field, and Joseph S. Pruitt, Appellants,

vs.

James T. Powell and John S. Daisy, Appellees.

ORDER ALLOWING APPEAL.

The appellants in the above entitled suit having prayed for the allowance of an appeal in this cause to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decree made and entered in the above entitled suit by the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia on the 13th day of November, 1930, (a rehearing whereof was denied by said court on the 23rd day of January, 1931) and having presented and filed their petition for an appeal, assignment of errors, and prayer for reversal, pursuant to the statutes and the rules of the Supreme Court of the United States in such case made and provided;

It is now here ordered by this Court that an appeal be, and the same is hereby, allowed to the Supreme Court of the United States from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia in the above entitled cause, as provided by law, and it is further ordered that the clerk of said court shall prepare and certify a transcript of the record, proceedings and decree in this cause, and transmit the same to the Supreme Court of the United States, so that he shall have the same in said Court within thirty days of this date.

And it is further ordered that security for costs on appeal be fixed in the sum of $500.00.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Samuel B. Field and Joseph S. Pruitt, Appellants,

vs.

James T. Powell and John S. Daisy.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the appellants to substitute Nellie Field Burwell, sole devisee and executrix of Samuel B. Field, deceased, as a party appellant in this cause in place of the said Samuel B. Field;

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the said Nellie Field Burwell be substituted as a party appellant in this cause in place and stead of Samuel B. Field, deceased.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Texas and Pacific Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
744 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 5th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Louisiana & Arkansas Ry. Co., et al., Appellants,
744 vs.
The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

On consideration of the motion by counsel for the appellants to make the Louisiana Public Service Commission a party appellant in this cause, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the Louisiana Public Service Commission be, and it is hereby, made a party appellant in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

City of Chicago, Appellant,
753 vs.
Chicago Rapid Transit Company.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Magno Santovincenzo, Consul of the Kingdom of Italy, at New York, Appellant,
787 vs.
James F. Egan, Public Administrator, etc.

It is now here ordered by the Court that further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court be postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles F. Noack, Ted Hendricksen,
Charlie Olsen, et al.,
Appellants,
361 vs.
I. Zellerbach, Reginald B. Fernald,
M. J. Connell, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Western Land & Reclamation Company,
Appellant,
290 vs.
The Reclamation Board of the State of
California, Sacramento and San Joaquin
Drainage District, et al., etc.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Francisco Lopez Sanchez,
Petitioner,
423 vs.
Antonia Gautier Y Borras.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Duquesne Steel Foundry Company,
Petitioner,
457 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Enameled Metals Company,

Petitioner,

489 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John Strong, Petitioner,

822 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dunbar & Sullivan Dredging Company,

Petitioner,

739 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank Dial,

Petitioner,

762 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Employer's Liability Assurance Corporation, Limited,

Petitioner,

794 vs.

Irving A. Durkee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Employer's Liability Assurance Corporation, Limited,

Petitioner,

795 vs.

Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California and Irving A. Durkee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District, State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District, State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Employer's Liability Assurance Corporation, Limited, Petitioner,
796 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California and Irving A. Durkee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
806 vs.
J. H. Hardy and Annie Helen Hardy, His Wife.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, 9th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 9th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby,denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Reading Company, Petitioner,
809 vs.
John Geary.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joy Chemical Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

810 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

William D. Moss, Supervisor of of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Permits, etc., et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Isidor Selkow, trading as Washington Harbor Supply Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

811 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Maurice Campbell, former Federal of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Prohibition Administrator, etc., et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

First National Bank in Dallas, Administrator of the Estate of Louis A. Pires, Deceased, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

816 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

David Burnet, Commissioner of of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ector A. Munn,

Petitioner,

817 vs.

Frank Collis Bowers, Executor of Frank K. Bowers, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Helene Walker King,

Petitioner,

818 vs.

A. C. Alexander, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Helene Walker King,

Petitioner,

819 vs.

A. C. Alexander, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby,denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Helene Walker King,

Petitioner,

820 vs.

A. C. Alexander, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Anna Ruzek,

Petitioner,

821 vs.

A. C. Alexander, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lela Gaddis, et al.,

Petitioners,

824 vs.

Guy W. Junker, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, 9th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 9th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bank of Italy,

Petitioner,

826 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby,denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

First National Bank of Fresno, California,

Petitioner,

827 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Erie Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

834 vs.

Grace M. O'Dell, Administratrix of the Estate of William O'Dell, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby,denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. W. Greene and Robert A. Meier, et al., Petitioners,
835 vs.
Joseph B. Uniacke.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Radio Corporation of America, Petitioner,
888 vs.
DeForest Radio Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louisiana Public Service Commission, etc., et al., Appellants,
804 vs.
The Texas & New Orleans Railroad Company, et al.;
State of Louisiana and Louisiana Public Service Commission, Appellants,
805 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in behalf of counsel for the appellants.

Carbice Corporation of America,
Petitioner,
54 vs.
American Patents Development Corporation, et al.

On consideration of the motion by counsel in behalf of the stockholders of the American Patents Development Corporation to pass this case,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company, et al.,
Appellants,
649 vs.
Allen J. Maxwell, Commissioner, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. J. Fraser Lyon, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Tax Commission of the State of South Carolina, in this cause.

State-Planters Bank and Trust Company, et al.,
166 vs.
T. Nelson Parker, et al.

On consideration of the motion for the immediate issuance of the mandate in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that the mandate issue forthwith.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph B. Straton, et al.,
137 vs.
Andy New, Jr., Trustee, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion for the immediate issuance of the mandate in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that the mandate issue forthwith.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New Orleans Land Company,
Appellant,
842 vs.
Board of Levee Commissioners of the Orleans Levee District.

The motion to affirm was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Wilkinson for the appellee in support of the motion, and by Mr. J. D. Dresner and Mr. Arthur A. Moreno for the appellant, in opposition thereto.

Louisiana Public Service Commission, etc.,
Appellants,
804 vs.
The Texas & New Orleans Railroad Company, et al.;
State of Louisiana and Louisiana Public Service Commission, Appellants,
805 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wylie M. Barrow and Mr. Percy Saint for the appellants.

North Star Chemical Works, Inc.,
Petitioner,
756 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Paul D. Miller, Mr. William W. Scott, and Mr. H. Brian Holland for the respondent.

Frank A. Mahutga,
Petitioner,
823 vs.
Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel A. Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry S. Mitchell and Mr. John E. Palmer for the respondent.

H. A. Wroe,
Petitioner,
825 vs.
James W. Bass, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John D. Cofer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Miss Helen R. Carloss, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The Farmers and Merchants State Bank of Morganville, etc.,
Petitioner,
829 vs.
H. W. Koeneke, Bank Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. C. Crane for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lee Bond for the respondent.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
830 vs.
J. V. Bridges.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander P. Stewart, Mr. Edward T. Miller, Mr. David W. Houston, Sr., and Mr. John W. Canada for the petitioners.

Lippman's Incorporated,
Petitioner,
832 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Sachs and Mr. Louis Caplan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John G. Remey, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Port Angeles Western Railroad Company, Petitioner,
840 vs.
Clallam County, Washington, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander C. Shaw for the petitioner, and by Mr. John H. Dunbar for the respondent.

Willie H. Underhill, Petitioner,
844 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cornelius Hardy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, Mr. F. Cadmus Damrell and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
855 vs.
A. A. Caillory.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 6th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. T. Henry and Mr. Frank W. Wozencraft for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. P. Jones for the respondent.

John P. Good, as Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
870 vs.
John T. Derr.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William R. Bagley for the petitioner, and by Mr. James M. Trask for the respondent.

Peter B. Freund and Gertrude Davis, Petitioners, 898 vs. E. H. Johnson, Trustee.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Meyer Abrams for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank Michels for the respondent.
Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, 899 vs. Edward Walters, a minor, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. Rudolph J. Kramer, Mr. Bruce A. Campbell, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the petitioner.
Frank L. Young, Petitioner, 490 vs. McNeal-Edwards Company.	The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Walter B. Leach for the petitioner, and the case was submitted by Mr. Asa P. French for the respondent.
Graniteville Manufacturing Company, Appellant, 596 vs. W. G. Query, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. P. F. Henderson for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.
Carbice Corporation of America, Petitioner, 54 vs. American Patents Development Corporation.	This case was reargued by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Neave for the respondents.

Liberty Central Trust Company, et al., Appellants, vs. Greenbrier College for Women, et al.	This case was argued by Mr. W. Elliott Nefflen for the appellees and the case was submitted by Mr. W. Chapman Revercomb for the appellants.
698	
The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Douglas Clyde Macintosh.	This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent.
504	
The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Marie Averil Bland.	On motion made to the Court by Miss Emily Marx, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Edward L. Parsons and others, as amici curiae, in this cause.
505	
The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Marie Averil Bland.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and continued by Miss Emily Marx for the respondent.
505	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that John W. Ford, Esquire, of Youngstown, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. Hardy Todd, It is ordered that Roy W. Johns, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,

505 vs.

Marie Averil Bland.

The argument of this case was concluded by Miss Emily Marx for the respondent.

State of Alabama and Alabama Public Service Commission, Appellants, vs. The United States of America, et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the appellants; by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the appellee, the Interstate Commerce Commission; by Mr. Frank W. Gwathmey for the appellees, Alabama carriers; and submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the appellee, the United States of America.
513	
Lewis-Simas-Jones Company, Petitioner, vs. Southern Pacific Company.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Robert E. Quirk for the petitioner, continued by Mr. J. R. Bell for the respondent, and by Mr. Robert E. Quirk for the petitioner.
520	

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr.Will R. Wood, It is ordered that James F. Pace, Esquire, of Gary, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel A. Edwards, It is ordered that Robert D. Austin, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Moultrie Hitt, It is ordered that C. Kibby Munson, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., It is ordered that Benicio F. Sanchez, Esquire, of San Juan, Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Georgia Public Service Commission, et al. Appellants, 555 vs. The United States of America, et al.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. Moultrie Hitt, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of The American Short Line Railroad Association, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
Lewis-Simas-Jones Company, Petitioner, 520 vs. Southern Pacific Company.	The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Robert E. Quirk for the petitioner.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 521 vs. Edith Andrews Logan; David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 522 vs. Julia Andrews Bruce.	The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Herbert C. Smyth for the respondent in No. 521, by Mr. John Enrietto for the respondent in No. 521, and concluded by Mr. Raymond B. Goodell for the respondent in No. 522.
Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, Petitioner, 543 vs. Noah Moquin.	This case was argued by Mr. Henry S. Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Tom Davis for the respondent.
Nash-Breyer Motor Company, etc., Petitioner, 549 vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Theodore B. Benson for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Arthur H. Deibert for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George C. Ober, Jr., It is ordered that Ernest Wright Stephens, Esquire, of Pierre, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick Gray Hudson, Jr., It is ordered that James Henry Gilfoil, Jr., Esquire, of Lake Providence, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel T. Ansell, It is ordered that Roscoe C. Rowe, Esquire, of Annapolis, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly, It is ordered that Charles Horowitz, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that Raymer F. Maguire, Esquire, of Orlando, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that Harry M. Voorhis, Esquire, of Orlando, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The City of New York.

This case was argued on the exceptions to the report of the special master by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly for the defendant in support thereof, and by Mr. Duane E. Minard for the complainant in opposition thereto.

Georgia Public Service Commission, et al., Appellants,
555 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John S. Burchmore for the appellants, the Georgia Public Service Commission, et al.; continued by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the appellees, the United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission; by Mr. Robert C. Alston for the appellees, the Atlantic Coast Line R. R. Co., et al.; and concluded by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the appellants, the State Highway Board, et al.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
563 vs.
Delmar Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. R. J. Hagman for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Fred W. Putnam for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Elmer E. Finck, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Vallance, It is ordered that John McDill Fox, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Duncan U. Fletcher, It is ordered that William Oliver Murrell, Esquire, of Orlando, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Vallance, It is ordered that Robert James White, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Davis, It is ordered that Arthur R. Young, Esquire, of Charleston, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. Davis, It is ordered that Robert McCormick Figg, Jr., Esquire, of Charleston, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmont B. Hazard, It is ordered that David M. Wood, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that Maja Leon Berry, Esquire, of Toms River, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

De Forest Radio Company,
Petitioner,
630 vs.
General Electric Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. John P. Neary, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Chemical Foundation, Inc., and others, as amici curiae, in this cause.

Great Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
563 vs.
Delmar Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Fred W. Putnam for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. R. J. Hagman for the petitioner.

Thomas L. Wolfe, et al., Appellants, vs. Patrick J. Hurley, Secretary of War, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Hugh Tullis for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.
624	
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. J. L. Powe, as Administrator, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Thomas W. Davis and Mr. Arthur R. Young for the petitioner, and by Mr. John P. Grace for the respondent.
600	
De Forest Radio Company, Petitioner, vs. General Electric Company.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the petitioner.
630	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, MAY 4, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph S. Fowler, It is ordered that Donald Gottwald, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William M. Williams, It is ordered that Louis B. Ewbank, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal C. Johnson, It is ordered that Michael C. Luddy, Esquire, of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Pedro Guevara, It is ordered that Manuel Guevara Zamora, Esquire, of Manila, Philipp Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold H. Marsh, It is ordered that G. H. Birrell, Esquire, of Warren, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold H. Marsh, It is ordered that Geo. W. Secrest, Esquire, of Warren, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold H. Marsh, It is ordered that Howard Booher, Esquire, of Warren, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Harry D. Williams, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Lawrence G. Williams, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Alan V. Parker, Esquire, of Niagara Falls, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Twin City Pipe Line Company and
Industrial Oil & Gas Company, Petitioners,
330 vs.
Harding Glass Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

State of New Jersey, Complainant,
16, Original. vs.
State of New York and City of New York, Defendants; Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Intervenor.

ORDER.

This cause came on to be heard on the exceptions filed by the parties to the report of the Special Master, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by the Court that the report of the Special Master in this cause be, and the same is hereby, confirmed, and that a decree be entered in the case in accordance with the provisions set forth in the opinion announced this day.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Smoot Sand and Gravel Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Washington Airport, Incorporated. 678 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

May Norwood and Carlisle Norwood, Appellants, vs. John J. Bennett, Jr., Attorney General of the State of New York, et al., etc. 748 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Liberty Central Trust Company, a
Corporation, and Meredith C. Jones,
Trustees, Appellants, Appeal from the District Court of
698 vs. the United States for the Southern
Greenbrier College for Women, a District of West Virginia.
Corporation, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thomas L. Wolfe, Grace C. Wolfe and
Ida B. Sturgess, Appellants, Appeal from the District Court of
624 vs. the United States for the Western
Patrick J. Hurley, Secretary of War, District of Louisiana.
et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana, and was argued by cou

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louisiana Public Service Commission,
etc., et al., Appellants,
804 vs.
The Texas & New Orleans Railroad
Company, et al.;
State of Louisiana, et al. Appellants,
805 vs.
The United States of America, Inter-
state Commerce Commission, et al.

In these cases probable jurisdiction is noted. The motion to advance is granted and the cases are advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 5 next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
899 vs.
Edward Walters, a Minor, by Herman Walters, His Father and Next Friend.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

North Star Chemical Works, Inc.,
Petitioner,
756 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank A. Mahutga,
Petitioner,
823 vs.
Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

H. A. Wroe,

Petitioner,

825 vs.

James W. Bass, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Farmers and Merchants State Bank of Morganville, Kansas, suing for itself and seventeen others,

Petitioner,

829 vs.

H. W. Koeneke, Bank Commissioner of the State of Kansas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Petitioners,

830 vs.

J. V. Bridges.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lippman's Incorporated,

Petitioner,

832 vs.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the 23rd District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Port Angeles Western Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

840 vs.

Clallam County, Washington, J. W. Pike, Sheriff, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wilie H. Underhill,

Petitioner,

844 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. A. A. Guillory. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, 6th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

855

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 6th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John P. Good, as Receiver of the Interstate Securities Company, Petitioner, vs. John T. Derr. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

870

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Peter B. Freund and Gertrude Davis, Petitioners, vs. E. H. Johnson, Trustee. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

898

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order:

O R D E R.

The Court will take a recess from to-day until Monday, May 18; from that day until Monday, May 25, and from that day until Monday, June 1, upon which day it will adjourn for the term.

A. D. Cummins and Company, Petitioner,
754 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent to postpone the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause until Monday, May 25 next,

It is now here ordered by this court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, with leave to the respondent to file brief by that date.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Group No. 1 Oil Corporation, Petitioner,
425 vs.
James W. Bass, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file brief of the State of Texas, as amicus curiae in support of the petition for rehearing and for stay of the mandate pending the action of the Court on the petition for rehearing,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Parlex Holding Corporation, Petitioner,
863 vs.
The City of New York.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the petitioner to postpone the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause until Monday, May 25 next,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Washington, Complainant,
—, Original. vs.
The State of Oregon.

The motion for leave to file bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blai Mallon in behalf of counsel for the complainant.

Stacy-Vorwerk Company, Petitioner,
828 vs.
C. L. Buck, doing business as C. L. Buck & Son, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wyoming was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Michael A. Rattigan for the petitioner

Southern Transportation Company, et al., Petitioners,
843 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Karl Knox Gartner for the petitioners, and by Mr. Nelson Thomas and Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the respondent.

Chicagoff Extension Gold Mining Company, Petitioner,
848 vs.
Alaska Handy Gold Mining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Metson and Mr. A. H. Ricketts for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. W. Clements and Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the respondent.

State of Utah, Petitioner,
849 vs.
The United States of America;
Carbon County Land Company, Petitioner,
877 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Parker and Mr. Mahlon E. Wilson for the petitioner in No. 849, by Mr. Samuel A. King for the petitioner in No. 877, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Nat M. Lacy, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

The Bauer Brothers Company, Petitioner,
850 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer C. Corry for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John G. Remey, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Mike Salibo, Petitioner,
851 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

B. J. Palmer, Petitioner,
853 vs.
The Aeolian Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. G. Bush for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joe R. Lane for the respondent.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company of Texas, Petitioner,
856 vs.
W. H. Hempkins.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Sixth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, Mr. C. C. Huff, Mr. C. S. Burg, and Mr. H. E. Howell for the petitioner.

Jim Bonner, Petitioner,
857 vs.
The United States of America;
Jim Bonner, Petitioner,
858 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Dodd for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, Mr. A. E. Gottschall, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

John Wright, et al., Petitioners,
862 vs.
The Federal Reserve Life Insurance Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas F. Doran and Mr. Frank Doster for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. H. Brady for the respondent.

Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
866 vs.
R. R. Moore, as Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. Frank G. Thompkins, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the petitioner.

Champ Spring Company, Petitioner,
876 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter R. Mayne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. S. Dee Hanson, Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Newton Todd, Petitioner, 885 vs. Citizens Gas Company of Indianapolis, et al., etc.; John J. Cotter, et al., Petitioners, 886 vs. Citizens Gas Company of Indianapolis, et al., etc.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick E. Matson, Mr. Earl B. Barnes, Mr. William L. Taylor, and Mr. Walter T. Kinder for the petitioners, and by Mr. W. H. Thompson, Mr. Henry H. Hornbrook, and Mr. Albert L. Rabb for the respondents.
Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, 892 vs. Mrs. Julia M. Varnell.	The petition for writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the petitioner, and by Mr. William Shelton Pritchard for the respondent.
William Rogers, Petitioner, 897 vs. James E. Watson, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United StatesCircuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto Gresham for the petitioner, and by Mr. William L. Taylor, Mr. Arthur L. Gilliom, and Mr. Albert Ward for the respondents.
DeForest Radio Company, Petitioner, 630 vs. General Electric Company.	The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Ralph B. Evans for the respondent.
A. Spates Brady, Appellant, 632 vs. The United States of America, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George T. Bell for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

MONDAY, MAY 18, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert S. Lisenby, It is ordered that Willis Raymond Lansford, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Wilmeth, It is ordered that Hiram P. Whitacre, Esquire, of Charlotte, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl T. Mack, It is ordered that Arthur M. Hahn, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Josephus C. Trimble, It is ordered that Robert W. Lyons, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clyde B. Aitchison, It is ordered that Carl S. Carlsmith, Esquire, of Hilo, Territory of Hawaii, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Josephus C. Trimble, It is ordered that Cecil C. Tague, Esquire, of Brookville, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that George Richard Warfield, Esquire, of Gardner, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur A. Alexander, It is ordered that Roland Abenchain, Esquire, of South Bend, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, It is ordered that Samuel M. Chapin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ray W. Nedrow, It is ordered that H. R. Partlow, Esquire, of Paragould, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marion Butler, It is ordered that George Seagrave Franklin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry B. Morrow, It is ordered that Roy G. Lord, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond Jones, It is ordered that Frederick W. Lyle, Esquire, of ~~Williamsburg~~ Wilkinsburg State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

W. W. Custer,

Petitioner,

422 vs.

Rob B. McCutcheon, Substituted for F. M. Breshears, Deceased, United States Marshal for the District of Idaho.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste.
Marie Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Noah Moquin. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

543

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and on motion to dismiss the writ or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Floy P. Baldwin, Petitioner, vs. Iowa State Traveling Men's Association. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

445

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

State Board of Tax Commissioners of
the State of Indiana, James Showalter,
Pliny H. Wolfard, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
183 vs.
LaFayette A. Jackson.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Indiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Indiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Indiana with instructions to dismiss the bill of complaint.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Sutherland in which Mr. Justice Van Devanter, Mr. Justice McReynolds, and Mr. Justice Butler concur.

Nash-Breyer Motor Company, Formerly
Troy Motor Sales Company,
Petitioner,
549 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner, vs. Hershey Chocolate Co. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

426

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner, vs. Hershey Chocolate Co. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

427

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner, vs. Hershey Chocolate Co.

428

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner, vs. Hershey Chocolate Co.

429

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

B. D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner, vs. Hershey Chocolate Co.

430

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner, vs. Hershey Chocolate Co.

431

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformith with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner, vs. Klein Chocolate Co.

432

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner, vs. Klein Chocolate Co.

433

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner, vs. Klein Chocolate Co.

434

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner, vs. Klein Chocolate Co.

435

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
436 vs.
Wilbur Suchard Chocolate Co.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said united States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner,
437 vs.
Wilbur Suchard Chocolate Co.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner, vs. Wilbur-Suchard Chocolate Co.

438

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Est. B. F. Davis, Collector, Petitioner, vs. York Chocolate Co.

439

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Est. E. Lederer, Collector, Petitioner, vs. York Chocolate Co.

440

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Blakely D. McCaughn, Collector, Petitioner, vs. York Chocolate Co.

441

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Gasoline Products Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Champlin Refining Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

362

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maine with directions to enter judgment for the petitioner-plaintiff on its writ on the verdict for $61,530.56 in its favor, which judgment shall be stayed pending the retrial of the issues arising on the counterclaim, or until further order of the District Court, and for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Merchants Warehouse Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and James Gallagher, et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

635

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Merchants Warehouse Company, The Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Board of Trade, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and James Gallagher, et al.

636 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Walter A. Bailey, et al., Appellants, vs. Merchants Warehouse Company, the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, Grocers' & Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia.

637 Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the stay order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Pennsylvania Warehousing and Safe Deposit Company,

Appellant,

638 vs.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Walter A. Bailey, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Pennsylvania Warehousing & Safe Deposit Company, The Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Board of Trade, et al., Appellants,

639 vs.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission and Walter A. Bailey, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Walter A. Bailey, et al., Appellants, vs. The Pennsylvania Warehousing & Safe Deposit Company, The Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, Grocers' & Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia.

640 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the stay order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Philadelphia Warehousing & Cold Storage Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Rex & Company, Inc., et al.

641 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Philadelphia Warehousing & Cold Storage Company, The Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Board of Trade, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Rex & Company, Inc., et al.

642 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Walter A. Bailey, et al., Appellants, vs. The Philadelphia Warehousing & Cold Storage Company, The Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, Grocers' & Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia.

643 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the stay order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The East Ohio Gas Company,
Appellant,
vs.
The Tax Commission of Ohio, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio.

453

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
vs.
The City of New York, Defendant.

17, Original.

ORDER.

This cause came on for hearing on the exceptions of the defendant to the report of the Special Master, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is ordered that a decree be entered declaring that the plaintiff, the State of New Jersey, is entitled to an injunction as prayed in the complaint, but that before injunction shall issue a reasonable time will be accorded to the defendant, the City of New York, within which to carry into effect its proposed plan for the erection and operation of incinerators to destroy the materials such as are now being dumped by it at sea or to provide other means to be approved by the decree for the disposal of such materials. And, inasmuch as the evidence does not disclose what is such reasonable time the case is referred to the same Special Master for findings of fact upon that subject. He is authorized and directed to hear witnesses presented by each of the parties, and, should he deem it necessary so to do, to call witnesses of his own selection and then with all convenient speed to report to the Court his findings and a form of decree.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Carbice Corporation of America,

Petitioner,

54 vs.

American Patents Development Corporation and Dry Ice Corporation of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

As appears by the opinion of this Court filed March 9, 1931, it was held, upon the original argument of this case, that the decree of the Circuit Court of Appeals should be reversed and the bill be dismissed on the ground that the owner of a patent may not limit its use so as to require that the unpatented materials employed in practicing the invention shall be purchased from the licensor. Upon petition of the Carbice Company that the Court determine whether the decree of the Circuit Court of Appeals should not be reversed and the bill be dismissed also on the ground that Slate patent No. 1,595,426 is invalid, a re-argument limited to that question was granted. And as appears by the opinion of this Court filed May 18, 1931, it was held that the patent is invalid.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that on both of these grounds the decree of the said Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and the cause is remanded to the District Court with instructions to dismiss the bill.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

State of Arizona, Complainant,

19, Original. vs.

State of California, State of Nevada, State of Utah, State of New Mexico, State of Colorado, State of Wyoming, and Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

This cause came on to be heard on the motions of the defendants to dismiss the bill of complaint in this cause, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that the bill of complaint in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed without prejudice to an application for relief in case the stored water is used in such a way as to interfere with the enjoyment by Arizona, or those claiming under it, of any rights already perfected or with the right of Arizona to make additional legal appropriations and to enjoy the same.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting. Mr. Justice McReynolds.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
521 vs.
Edith Andrews Logan.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
522 vs.
Julia Andrews Bruce.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

United States of America ex relatione
Ethel M. McLennan,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

618 vs. Court of Appeals of the

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior. District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

United States of America ex rel.
H. H. Simpson,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

676 vs. Court of Appeals of the

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, and Charles C. Moore, Commissioner of the General Land Office. District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

United States of America ex relatione
Roy G. Barton,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

704 vs. Court of Appeals of the

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Department of the Interior. District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

United States of America ex rel.
W. B. Pyron,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

743 vs. Court of Appeals of the

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, and C. C. Moore, Commissioner of the General Land Office. District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Frank L. Young Company, Petitioner, vs. McNeal Edwards Company. 490

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. J. L. Powe, as Administrator of George A. Marshall, Deceased. 600

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Yetta Stromberg,
Appellant,
584 vs.
The People of the State of California.

Appeal from the District Court of Appeal of the State of California, Fourth Appellate District.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeals of the State of California, Fourth Appellate District, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court of Appeal, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of Appeal for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Butler.

Graniteville Manufacturing Company,
Appellant,
596 vs.
W. G. Query, J. P. Derham, and F. C. Robinson, Personally and as Members of the South Carolina Tax Commission.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company,

Appellant,

470 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California and Leon O. Whitsell, C. L. Seavey, et al., etc.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company,

Appellant,

471 vs.

Railroad Commission of the State of California and Leon O. Whitsell, C. L. Seavey, et al., etc.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Southern Pacific Company and Southern
Pacific Railroad Company,

Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

472 vs. State of California.

Railroad Commission of the State of
California and Leon O. Whitsell,
C. L. Seavey, et al., etc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

—

In the matter of the Disbarment of Leroy B. Delaney.

ORDER.

It appearing that a rule issued April 29, 1930, upon Leroy B. Delaney to show cause why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court has not been served;

It is ordered that a further notice issue to the said Delaney to show cause, on or before the first Monday in October next, why he should not be disbarred.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Washington, Complainant, vs. The State of Oregon. —, Original.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the bill of complaint in this cause,

It is now here ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and process is ordered to issue returnable on Monday, October 5 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant, vs. The State of Texas, Defendant, The United States of America, Intervener. 6, Original.

On consideration of the report of the Clerk relating to costs in this cause,

It is ordered:

(1) The Clerk's costs incurred by the States of Oklahoma and Texas shall be taxed and paid on the basis that each of the two States should bear one-half thereof.

(2) The Clerk's costs incurred by fifty-four interveners (other than the United States) who were parties to the special issues shall be taxed to them and paid by them in equal proportionate amounts.

(3) Rule 24 of the Rules of this Court, (promulgated December 22, 1911, amended) shall be applied in taxing the Clerk's fees for supervising the printing of the record; but in all other respects that Rule shall be regarded as not applicable to this cause, and (in lieu of compliance with the provisions of said Rule in those respects) the Clerk is authorized and directed to tax as clerk's costs the sum of $500 each against the complainant, the State of Oklahoma, and the defendant, the State of Texas, and the sum of $15 each against the fifty-four interveners (other than the United States) who were parties to the special issues, said amounts to be in addition to the fees for supervising the printing of the record.

(4) The Clerk is authorized and directed to tax the costs in this case in the manner and amounts shown by him in his report and to make refund of the amounts of balances due to the several parties entitled thereto.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Oklahoma, Complainant,

6, Original. vs. MEMORANDUM BY THE CLERK

The State of Texas, Defendant, REGARDING COSTS.

The United States of America, Intervener.

This case was filed December 8, 1919, as No. 27, Original of October Term, 1919. The final decree, removing the case from the docket was entered, March 17, 1930, under the number of No. 6, Original, October Term, 1929.

A survey has been conducted, by the Clerk, of the costs and condition of the finances in this case with a view to separating its several financial elements for final taxation of costs and closing the case on his books.

Monies were deposited with the Clerks of this Court in various sums and at various times by the parties to the "main case" and on behalf of certain interveners; advances of monies were made by the parties in the field; compensation was paid to the several commissioners; special masters; Receiver and his counsel, and the employees of each, by various methods of payment. All of such payments have been identified in the several reports of such commissioners, special masters, and the Receiver, and do not enter directly into the financial adjustment sought to be made by the present Clerk, who is concerned here with the "Court costs" of the litigation.

The death of Mr. Stonier, a deputy clerk familiar with the financial history of the case; the death of Mr. Fain who represented the United States; the death of Mr. Roote, who represented certain interveners, parties to the special issues which were considered by the Court in a five volume record involving the interests of fifty-five interveners; the death of Mr. Judd, who conferred with Mr. Stonier and counsel with respect to the division of costs of printing the various records; the constant changes in the offices of Attorneys General of Oklahoma and Texas; the change on two occasions of the administration of the Clerk's office of this Court and the immense and confused files of this case have made the matter complicated and difficult.

The present Clerk has verified, by examination of the books, accounts and reports and through consultation with the auditors, to his satisfaction, that (a) all expenses and compensation due to the several Commissioners and Special Masters have been paid; (b) that all printing bills incurred for printing records, reports of Commissioners and Special Masters have been paid; and (c) that the financial aspects of the Federal Receivership, in so far as they relate to the duty of the Clerk in the case are settled.

The Clerk has identified each and every deposit of monies made with him, or his predecessors, and each and every disbursement made by him, or his predecessors, in the case and has verified the correctness thereof from the books and through the auditors of Ernst and Ernst, employed by the Court to make annual inspections of the Clerk's accounts.

The review of action taken thus far, and the examination and verification of the correctness of each step narrows the remaining work for the settlement of the case to the taxation of the Clerk's costs due as the final step to close the case on the books of the Clerk.

The deposits, credits, advances and payments to and through the Clerk's office total $83,235.63 - (this sum does not contemplate payments, etc., made by the parties in the field regarding which investigation has been made and, so far as they are connected with the duties or responsibilities of the Clerks in this case, they are accounted for and have been properly adjusted.) From the total sum of deposits, credits, advances and payments above stated, the Clerks have disbursed $65,021.25 and such disbursements have been audited and certified correct by Ernst and Ernst. This leaves a balance of $18,232.38 in the hands of the Clerk to be accounted for in the taxation of fees due him under the Rules, and by refunds of any balances due to the parties entitled thereto.

The branch of the case, involving certain special issues, which was referred to James M. Hill, Esquire, as Special Master, (Order of January 19, 1925), was settled on May 14, 1925, pursuant to the order of the Court (Order of May 11, 1925). The cost of printing the Special Master's Report and taxed Clerk's costs were charged against deposits made by the parties to the special issues involved and balances of deposits refunded. The Clerk's accounts covering this settlement and these refunds have been verified and certified by the auditors, and are, therefore, not considered in this memorandum.

The decree of this Court dated March 12, 1923, (261 U. S. 340), specifies that "The cost of executing this decree, including the compensation of the Commissioners, shall be borne in equal parts by the State of Oklahoma, the State of Texas and the United States", and subsequent decrees of the Court, in later phases of the case adopted a similar distribution of the costs, and it is presumed that the Clerk's costs should follow and be computed on the same basis of distribution.

Payments to the printers for the cost of printing records were, therefore, made upon that basis, either from monies on deposit, or by direct payment to the printers by the parties in the amount of their respective shares.

The supervising fee upon: (a) the record in the main case, part 1 - 3 vols; (b) record in the main case, part 2 - 6 vols; (c) Interveners record 5 vols., and (d) Agreed record on the 100th Meridian, 1 vol., has been taxed pursuant to the Rule of this Court applicable to this case. Applying the division of costs similar to that specified in the decree of March 12, 1923, one-third of the supervising fee was taxed against the States of Oklahoma and Texas respectively and the one-third taxed against the United States charged off, since Clerk's costs are not taxable against the United States. (Reference is made to a letter of former Mr. Chief Justice Taft, December 20, 1921, in regard to the treatment of costs of the United States in this case.)

After deducting from the several deposits, credits, payments and advances all disbursements made and certified to by the auditors, the supervising fee, taxed as above stated, has been deducted from the balances on hand, held to the credit of the parties to the main case.

In the instance of the Interveners on the special issues the same treatment was adopted, except that the supervising fee was deducted from the gross deposit made by the "Committee of the Interveners", which committee acted on behalf of all parties to the said special issues.

This leaves the financial condition of the case, in the Clerk's Office as follows:

Balance on hand to credit of Oklahoma.	$4,673.63
Balance on hand to credit of Texas	4,623.63
Balance on hand to credit of the United States	0,000.00
Balance on hand to credit of Interveners Committee	1,147.95

There remains for consideration the matter of Clerk's fees other than the fee for supervising the printing of the records. The taxation of these "other fees" presents, in this case, practical difficulties if the usual method is applied as the Rule does not contemplate a case of this character which is unique in its number of phases and parties. The miscellaneous costs with which the Clerk is now concerned are the numerous small items mainly under Rule 24 (Rules promulgated December 22, 1911, amended, and which apply to this case by reason of the date of its filing). Minute examination of the mass of correspondence and the separation, allocation and taxation individually of the hundreds of "papers filed"; submissions; transfers; appearances; recording fees; etc., etc., would require such time and labor by experienced members of the staff of the Clerk's Office as to suggest that it would be an economically unsound undertaking as the cost of such work would exceed the amount of the fees taxable under

It is therefore respectfully recommended that the Court consider an order which would authorize the Clerk to apply the supervising fee on the several records in accordance with the applicable rule and with respect to the miscellaneous Clerk's costs direct that a "flat fee" be substituted in lieu of applying the usual method of computing the amount of such costs. In the "main case" a flat fee of $500 each taxable against the States of Oklahoma and Texas respectively would represent payment at the rate of $100 per term, or $50 each, (the case was on the docket for ten years), by the parties to the Clerk as compensation for services in the discharge of his duties in this respect.

As to the Interveners, appearances were entered at the hearings before the Commissioner for 54 separate or associated groups of parties and for the United States. To differentiate between these parties and sub-divide the fractions of fees under the usual method of taxing the miscellaneous costs would be laborious and difficult to a point of impracticability. It is therefore, respectfully recommended that in this branch of the case, that the Court consider authorizing the Clerk to apply a flat fee, the amount of which is suggested as $15 for each party, or association of parties, not including the United States or a total sum of $810. This would yield, considering the length of time these parties were on the docket, compensation to the Clerk of approximately $3 per party per term of Court.

If the recommendation of the Clerk for the application of a flat fee in lieu of itemized taxation of the miscellaneous fees is approved, the financial status of the case will be as follows:

Balances on hand after all costs have been paid, which amounts of balances should be refunded to the parties as follows:

To the State of Oklahoma.	$4,173.63	
To the State of Texas	4,123.63	
To the United States.	0,000.00	
To the Interveners Committee.	337.95	
Total refunds	$8,635.21	- $8,635.21
Total supervising fees on all records printed plus "flat fees" proposed.		$9,542.12
Clerk's costs on "special issues" before Special Master Hill, taxed May 14, 1925		55.05
Total.		$18,232.38

RECAPITULATION.

Balance of monies on hand to be accounted for		$18,232.38
Total Clerk's costs, including flat fee	$9,542.12	
Total refunds due to parties	8,635.21	
Earned clerks' costs (Hill report).	55.05	
Total	$18,232.38	$18,232.38

If the recommendation of the Clerk is adopted and an order entered making provision for the taxation of costs in this case as herein suggested, the case may be closed on the books of the Clerk.

Very respectfully submitted,

CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY,

Clerk.

The United States of America,

Complainant,

14, Original. vs. DECREE.

The State of Utah.

This cause came on to be heard by this Court, upon the exceptions of the parties hereto, to the report of the Special Master.

Now, therefore, for the purpose of carrying into effect the conclusions of the Court, as stated in its opinion, dated April 13, 1931, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that:

1. The Bill of Complaint, in so far as it relates to the Green River, is dismissed. The Green River, from a point where the river crosses the township line between townships 23 and 24 South, Range 17 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, to the confluence of the Grand (Colorado) River, is now and at all times on and after January 4, 1896, has been, a navigable river, and the title to the bed thereof vested in the State of Utah upon its admission into the Union on January 4, 1896, except so far as the United States of America may theretofore have made grants thereof. The United States of America is forever enjoined from asserting any estate, right, title, or interest in and to said river bed, or any part thereof, adverse to the State of Utah, or its grantees; and from in any manner disturbing or interfering with the possession, use, and enjoyment thereof by the State of Utah or its grantees.

2. The Bill of Complaint, in so far as it relates to the Grand (Colorado) River, is dismissed. The Grand (Colorado) River from a point located at the mouth of Castle Creek to the confluence of the Grand (Colorado) River with the Green River, is now and at all times on and after January 4, 1896, has been, a navigable stream, and title to the bed thereof vested in the State of Utah upon its admission into the Union on January 4, 1896, except so far as the United States of America may theretofore have made grants thereof. The United States of America is forever enjoined from asserting any estate, right, title, or interest in and to said river bed, or any part thereof, adverse to the State of Utah or its grantees, and from in any manner disturbing or interfering with the possession, use, and enjoyment thereof by the State of Utah or its grantees.

3. The Bill of Complaint, so far as it relates to the Colorado River, from the confluence of the Green River and the Grand (Colorado) River to Mile 212.15 above Lees Ferry, Arizona, and from Mile 176 above Lees Ferry, Arizona, to the Utah-Arizona Boundary Line, is dismissed. Said stretches of said river and each of them are now and at all times on and after January 4, 1896, have been navigable, and title to the beds of said last-mentioned stretches of river and each of them vested in the State of Utah upon its admission into the Union on January 4, 1896, except so far as the United States of America may theretofore have made grants thereof. The United States of America is forever enjoined from asserting any estate, right, title, or interest in and to said beds of said last-mentioned stretches of river or in or to any portion of said last-mentioned beds, or either of them, adverse to the State of Utah or its grantees, and from in any manner disturbing or interfering with the possession, use, and enjoyment thereof by the State of Utah or its grantees.

4. The Colorado River from Mile 212.15 above Lees Ferry, Arizona, to Mile 176 above Lees Ferry, Arizona, is not a navigable river and the title to the bed of said last-mentioned stretch of river is vested in the United States of America, except as to lands heretofore granted, and the State of Utah is forever enjoined from asserting any estate, right, title, or interest in and to said bed of said last-mentioned stretch of river or in and to any part of said last-mentioned bed, adverse to the United States of America, or its grantees; and from in any manner disturbing or interfering with the possession, use, and enjoyment thereof, by the United States of America, or its grantees.

5. The San Juan River, from the mouth of Chinle Creek to the Confluence of the San Juan and Colorado Rivers, is not a navigable river, and the title to the river bed is vested in the United States of America, except as to lands heretofore granted, and the State of Utah is forever enjoined from asserting any estate, right, title, or interest in and to said river bed, or any part thereof, adverse to the United States of America, or its grantees; and from in any manner disturbing or interfering with the possession, use, and enjoyment thereof, by the United States of America, or its grantees.

6. The United States of America shall in nowise be prevented from taking any such action in relation to said rivers, or any of them, as may be necessary to protect and preserve the navigability of any navigable waters of the United States of America.

7. It is further adjudged and decreed by the Court that each party hereto pay its own costs and that each party hereto pay one-half of the expenses incurred by the Special Master, and also one-half of the amount to be fixed by the Court as the compensation of the Special Master.

The United States of America, Complainapt,

14, Original. vs. ORDER.

The State of Utah.

On consideration of the statement by the Special Master in this cause, Charles Warren, Esq., showing the time spent and expenses incurred by him in his capacity as Special Master,

It is now here ordered that the said Charles Warren is awarded the sum of $14,000 as compensation for his services as Special Master in this cause, and that his disbursements in the sum of $1,007.59 are allowed; one-half of the amount of such compensation and expenses to be paid by each of the parties herein, as provided in the decree entered this date.

A. Spates Brady,

Appellant,

632 vs.

The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of dismissal of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State of Utah,

Petitioner,

849 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 5th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Carbon County Land Company,
Petitioner,
877 vs.
The United States of America, Independent Coal and Coke Company and State of Utah.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 5th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
866 vs.
R. R. Moore, as Administrator of the Estate of Edwin A. Wagnon, Deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Stacy-Vorwerk Company,
Petitioner,
828 vs.
C. L. Buck, Doing Business as C. L. Buck & Son, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wyoming.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wyoming, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Transportation Company,
Eastern Transportation Company,
et al., Petitioners,
843 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicagoff Extension Gold Mining Company,
Petitioner,
848 vs.
Alaska Handy Gold Mining Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Apeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Bauer Brothers Company,
Petitioner,
850 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mike Salibo, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 851

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

B. J. Palmer, Petitioner, vs. The Aeolian Company. 853

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company of Texas, Petitioner, vs. W. H. Hempkins. 856

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, 6th Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 6th/Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had.

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jim Bonner, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

857

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jim Bonner, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

858

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John Wright, George W. Ziegler and Ed Hossfeld, Petitioners, vs. The Federal Reserve Life Insurance Company, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

862

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Champ Spring Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 876

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Newton Todd, Petitioner, vs. Citizens Gas Company of Indianapolis, et al., etc. 885

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John J. Cotter, Emy Martin, Executrix of the Estate of Elsie Martin, Deceased, Petitioners, vs. Citizens Gas Company of Indianapolis, et al., etc. 886

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
892 vs.
Mrs. Julia M. Varnell.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Rogers,
Petitioner,
897 vs.
James E. Watson, M. Bert Thurman, Milton Clawson, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mutual Lumber Company,
Petitioner,
872 vs.
Burns Poe, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

On consideration of the motion by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent to postpone the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause until October 5th next;

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, with leave to file brief for respondent on or before September 10th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

P. L. Mann,
Petitioner,
875 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher to postpone the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause until May 25th next,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Martin A. Leach,
Appellant,
686 vs.
The People of the State of California.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Louis Titus, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Raymond Benjamin and Henry P. Goodwin, as amici curiae, in opposition to motion to dismiss, in this case.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Ry. Co., et al.,
Appellants,
943 vs.
The United States, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred P. Thom for the appellants.

New Orleans Land Company,
Appellant,
842 vs.
Board of Levee Commissioners of Orleans Levee District.

On consideration of the motion by Mr. R. Granville Curry in behalf of counsel for the appellant for leave to file out of time the statement as to jurisdiction in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

In re Disbarment of
William E. Baff.

The return to the rule to show cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Kirtland I. Perky for the respondent.

24, Original,
Ex parte: Madden Bros. Inc.,
Petitioner.

The return of Hon. Joseph W. Molyneaux, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, to the rule to show cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry N. Benson, Mr. Charles E. Phillips, and Mr. John F. Bonner in that behalf.

Martin A. Leach,
Appellant,
686 vs.
The People of the State of California.

The motion to dismiss herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. U. S. Webb for the appellee, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Jesse I. Miller for the appellant, in opposition thereto.

Frank L. Smith, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
841 vs.
Illinois Bell Telephone Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles M. Bracelen, Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, Mr. William H. Thompson, Mr. Kenneth F. Burgess, and Mr. Leslie N. Jones for the appellee, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom, Mr. George I. Haight, Mr. Benjamin F. Goldstein, Mr. Edmund D. Adcock, and Mr. Francis X. Busch for the appellant, in opposition thereto.

Bandini Petroleum Company, et al.,
Appellants,
852 vs.
The Superior Court of the State of California, etc., et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. U. S. Webb and Mr. James S. Bennett for the respondents, in support thereof, and by Mr. Robert B. Murphey and Mr. Asa V. Call for the appellants, in opposition thereto.

Minnie D. Smith, Petitioner, 964 vs. John B. Daniel.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Minnie D. Smith, pro se.
Claude Nichols, Petitioner, 966 vs. The United States of America.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Claude Nichols, pro se.
Painters District Council No. 14 of Chicago, etc., et al., Appellants, 836 vs. The United States of America.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Rodriguez for the appellants.
Frank L. Smith, et al., etc., Appellants, 841 vs. Illinois Bell Telephone Company.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom, Mr. Samuel A. Ettelson, Mr. George I. Haight, Mr. Benjamin F. Goldstein, and Mr. Edmund D. Adcock for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. Charles M. Bracelen, Mr. Horace Kent Tenney, Mr. William H. Thompson, Mr. Kenneth F. Burgess, and Mr. Leslie N. Jones for the appellee, in opposition thereto.
New Orleans Land Company, Appellant, 842 vs. Board of Levee Commissioners of the Orleans Levee District.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur A. Moreno and Mr. J. D. Dresner for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. James Wilkinson for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Bandini Petroleum Company, et al.,
Appellants,
852 vs.
The Superior Court of the State of California, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert B. Murphey and Mr. Asa V. Call for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. U. S. Webb and Mr. James S. Bennett for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

M. J. Loftus, et al.,
Appellants,
854 vs.
Department of Agriculture of the State of Iowa, et al., etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. McVann for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. John Fletcher and Mr. Earl F. Wisdom for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Bandini Petroleum Company,et al.,
Petitioners,
852 vs.
The Superior Court of the State of California, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, State of California, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert B. Murphey and Mr. Asa V. Call for the petitioners, and by Mr. U. S. Webb and Mr. James S. Bennett for the respondents.

W. C. Austin, Receiver of O. K. Cattle Company,
Petitioner,
860 vs.
C. F. Osborne, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. C. Ray for the petitioner, and by Mr. William J. Berne for the respondents.

Robert L. McElroy, et al., Petitioners, 861 vs. Borough of Fort Lee.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Carey for the petitioners, and by Mr. Howard Mackay for the respondent.
St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, et al., Petitioners, 868 vs. Orel Bishop, Administratrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alexander P. Stewart, Mr. Edward T. Miller, and Mr. Edward L. Westbrook for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank Pace and Mr. G. L. Grant for the respondent.
Frank Dial, Petitioner, 874 vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Dial, pro se; and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.
Mississippi Valley Trust Company, as Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners, 878 vs. Gustavus A. Buder, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. M. Pierce for the petitioners.

Hartford Electric Supply Company,
Petitioner,
879 vs.
Joseph Sachs & Colt's Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter F. Murray for the petitioner and by Mr. Oscar W. Jeffery and Mr. Harry G. Kimball for the respondent.

H. E. Byram, et al.,
Petitioners,
880 vs.
F. M. Miner and Robert J. McDonal, copartners, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur C. Erdall and Mr. F. W. Root for the petitioners, and by Mr. Mortimer H. Boutelle and Mr. Frederick M. Miner for the respondents.

The Seaboard Citizens National Bank of Norfolk,
Petitioner,
881 vs.
Alan J. Hofheimer, Executor, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Mann for the petitioner, and by Mr. James E. Heath for the respondent.

Cora Ryan, Administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
882 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Stephens and Mr. Charles W. Steiger for the petitioner.

James Kellar, alias James Kirk, etc., Petitioner,
883 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred E. Roth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The State of Kansas on the relation of Roland Boynton, Attorney General, Petitioner,
884 vs.
The Board of County Commissioners of Shawnee County, Kansas, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas F. Doran, Mr. Roland Boynton, and Mr. Frank Doster for the petitioners.

Osaka Shosen Kaisha, Petitioner,
887 vs.
Olivier Straw Goods Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Crandall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry H. Longley and Mr. Ezra G. Benedict Fox for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
889 vs.
Edward Ryan, Claimant, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. John P. Byrne, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
890 vs.
George Anderson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Mahlon D. Keefer, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner.

J. W. Dana,
Petitioner,
891 vs.
F. J. Searight, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Beck and Mr. Malcolm E. Rosser for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ed. J. Fleming, Mr. H. A. Tallman, Mr. Randolph Shirk, Mr. H. F. Aby, and Mr. W. F. Tucker for the respondents.

Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
893 vs.
Harry C. Trout.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. L. Bell, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. Luther Burns, Mr. Henry S. Conrad, and Mr. Liston E. Durham for the petitioner, and by Mr. M. J. Henderson for the respondent.

The Bank of United States,
Petitioner,
894 vs.
Irving Trust Company, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein /to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David Haar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel Blumberg for the respondent.

Western Pacific California Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
896 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. M. Angellotti and Harriet P. Tyler for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. O. Amonette, Mr. H. C. Booth, Mr. C. W. Durbrow, and Mr. Guy V. Shoup for the respondent.

Albert Pick & Company,
Petitioner,
900 vs.
Peoples Bank of Buffalo, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the County Court of Erie County, State of New York, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred M. Saperston for the petitioner, and by Mr. George W. Offutt for the respondent.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
903 vs.
William R. Irons.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clement K. Corbin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas G. Haight and Mr. Charles Hershenstein for the respondent.

I. J. Van Huffel,
Petitioner,
906 vs.
Trace D. Harkelrode, Treasurer of Trumbell County, Ohio, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of Trumbull County, State of Ohio, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. H. Hoppe for the petitioner, and by Mr. G. H. Birrell for the respondent.

I. J. Van Huffel,
Petitioner,
907 - vs.
Trace D. Markelrode, Treasurer of Trumbull County, Ohio, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. H. Hoppe for the petitioner and by Mr. C. H. Birrell for the respondent.

Standard Oil Company, Petitioner,
908 vs.
Glendola Steamship Corporation, Claimant, etc.;
Glendola Steamship Corporation,
Petitioner,
909 vs.
Standard Oil Company.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William M. McGrann for the petitioner in No. 908 and respondent in No. 909; by Mr. Horace M. Gray and Mr. Sanford H. E. Freund for the petitioner in No. 909 and respondent in No. 908.

Commercial Stevedoring Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
927 vs.
Anna Dowdell, as Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence E. Mellen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sol Gelb for the respondent.

March Haynes, Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner,
928 vs.
Union Carbide and Carbon Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Conrad Wolfe and Mr. Earl B. Barnes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry H. Hornbrook, Mr. George A. Cooke, and Mr. Paul Y. Davis for the respondent.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
929 vs.
Luigi Pascucci.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Gibbons for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clifford H. Byrnes for the respondent.

Brief English Systems, Inc.,
Petitioner,
930 vs.
John P. Owen, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar M. Kitchin and Mr. William St. John Tozer for the petitioner, and by Mr. O. Ellery Edwards for the respondents.

Green Star Steamship Co., Ltd.,
Petitioner,
931 vs.
Armour & Co. et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Crawley for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. Roger Englar and Mr. Leonard J. Matteson for the respondent.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary, etc.,
Petitioner,
935 vs.
The United States of America, ex rel.
The Vindicator Consolidated Gold Mining Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, and Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edgar Watkins and Mr. J. C. Trimble for the respondent.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior,

Petitioner,

936 vs.

The United States of America, ex rel. Chestatee Pyrites & Chemical Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, and Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the petitioner, and by Mr. Marion Smith, Mr. Edgar Watkins, and Mr. Mac Asbill for the respondent.

W. E. Hedger Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

954 vs.

F. S. Royster Guano Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace T. Atkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles R. Hickox and Mr. Robert S. Erskine for the respondent.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John M. Sternhagen, It is ordered that Percy W. Phillips, Esquire, of Southampton, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Meyerhoff, It is ordered that Dawson E. Hale, Esquire, of Knoxville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. Rea Williams, It is ordered that Dan C. Flanagan, Esquire, of Ft. Wayne, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Randolph C. Shaw, It is ordered that T. S. Halstead, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dale D. Drain, It is ordered that Whitman Taylor, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dale D. Drain, It is ordered that Paul Carpenter, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Kerr, It is ordered that Joseph J. McGuigan, Esquire, of Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Miss Emma Wold, It is ordered that Helen K. MacDonald, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, It is ordered that Ritchie S. Barrie, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, It is ordered that J. Sterling Halstead, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, It is ordered that David LaVerne Courtney, Esquire, of Highland Park, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., it is ordered that Samuel Hoffman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Herrick, It is ordered that William K. Herrick, Esquire, of Cherokee, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, It is ordered that William A. Flanigan, Esquire, of Highland Park, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, It is ordered that Clyde L. Fulton, Esquire, of Highland Park, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, It is ordered that Colin J. McRae, Esquire, of Highland Park, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Rogers, It is ordered that Frank B. Hubachek, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Crosser, It is ordered that Francis Joseph Lawler, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, It is ordered that Maurice Blumenthal, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Vallance, It is ordered that Harvey F. Remington, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Vallance, It is ordered that Thomas H. Remington, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard S. LeRoy, It is ordered that John W. Remington, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Howard S. LeRoy, It is ordered that Francis K. Remington, Esquire, of Rochester, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, It is ordered that Walter W. Meinberg, Esquire, of Highland Park, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Miss Emma Wold, It is ordered that Besse Moton Garner, of Highland Park, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claude R. Branch, It is ordered that Maurice D. Sharai, Esquire, of Highland Park, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lowe P. Siddons, It is ordered that Charles C. Swartz, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl H. Richmond, It is ordered that Moffatt G. McDonald, Esquire, of Greenwood, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Coun ellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Richard B. Scandrett, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that John Edmond Hewitt, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Robert H. Jackson, Esquire, of Jamestown, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Delmar Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

563

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Minnesota for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Henry Choteau, Petitioner, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

81

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

DeForest Radio Company, Petitioner, vs. General Electric Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

630

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice McReynolds concurs in the result.

Lewis-Simas-Jones Company, Petitioner, vs. Southern Pacific Company. — On writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeals, First Appellate District, State of California.

520

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court of Appeal, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of Appeal for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States, Petitioner, vs. Douglas Clyde MacIntosh. 504

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and the decree of the District Court affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Connecticut for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Chief Justice Hughes, in which Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone concur.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Marie Averil Bland. 505

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and the decree of the District Court affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Chief Justice Hughes, in which Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, and Mr. Justice Stone concur.

Walter C. Fetters, United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Petitioner, vs. United States of America, ex rel. Thomas W. Cunningham. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

720

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, vs. Raladam Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

484

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Annie G. Phillips, Arthur L. Phillips,
Seymour Phillips, and Abraham S.
Phillips, Executors of the Estate
of I. L. Phillips, Deceased,
Petitioners,
455 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Maas & Waldstein Company,
Petitioner,
263 vs.
The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Indian Motocycle Company, On certificate from the

5 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States of America.

This cause came on to be heard on the amended certificate from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said Court of Claims.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Concurring: Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Stone, in which Mr. Justice Brandeis concurs.

Northport Power and Light Company,

Appellant,

66 vs. Appeal from the District Court of the

Roland H. Hartley, as Governor of the State of Washington, and John H. Dunbar, as Attorney General of the State of Washington. United States for the Western District of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

E. S. Smith,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

449 vs. State of Florida.

W. B. Cahoon, Sheriff of Duval

County, Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

State of New Jersey, Complainant,

16, Original. vs.

State of New York and City of New York, Defendants,

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Intervenor.

DECREE.

This cause came on to be heard by this Court upon the exceptions filed by the complainant and defendants to the report of the Special Master, and was argued by counsel for the States of New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and the City of New York.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, as follows:

1. That the injunction prayed for by the State of New Jersey so far as it would restrain the State of New York or City of New York from diverting from the Delaware River or its tributaries to the New York City water supply the equivalent of 440 million gallons of water daily be, and the same is hereby, denied, but is granted to restrain the said State and City from diverting water in excess of that amount. The denial of the injunction as above is subject to the following conditions:

(a) Before any diversion shall be made an efficient plant for the treatment of sewage at Port Jervis, New York, shall be constructed and the sewage of Port Jervis entering the Delaware or Neversink Rivers shall be treated to such an extent as to effect a reduction of 85% in the organic impurities. And the effluent from such plant shall be treated with a chemical germicide, or otherwise, so that the B. coli originally present in the sewage shall be reduced by 90%.

Untreated industrial waste from plants in said town of Port Jervis shall not be allowed to enter the Delaware or Neversink

Rivers, and the treatment of such industrial wastes shall be such as to render the effluent practically free from suspended matter and non-putrescent; and said treatment of sewage and industrial waste shall be maintained so long as any diversion is made from the Delaware River or its tributaries.

(b) At any time the stage of the Delaware River falls below .50 c. s. m. at Port Jervis, New York, or Trenton, New Jersey, or both (.50 c. s. m. being equivalent to a flow of 1535 c. f. s. at Port Jervis and 3400 c. f. s. at Trenton), water shall be released from one or more of the impounding reservoirs of New York City in sufficient volume to restore the flow at Port Jervis and Trenton to .50 c. s. m., provided, however, that there is not required to be released at any time water in excess of 30% of the diversion area yield, and the diversion area yield having been ascertained to be 2.2 c. s. m., the maximum release required shall be 30% of that amount, or .66 cubic feet per second per square mile of the areas from which water is diverted.

In determining the quantity of water to be released so as to add to the flow of the Delaware River, the Neversink River shall be treated as if it flowed into the Delaware River above Port Jervis, and the number of second feet of water released from the impounding reservoir on the Neversink River shall be added to the number of second feet of water released from other reservoirs, so as to determine whether the quantity of water, required by this decree to be released, has been released.

(c) That the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, through accredited representatives, shall at all reasonable times have the right to inspect the dams, reservoirs and other works constructed by the City of New York and to inspect the diversion areas and the inflow, outflow and diverted flow of said areas, and to inspect the meters and other apparatus installed by the City of New York and to inspect all records pertaining to inflow, outflow and diverted flow.

2. The diversion herein allowed shall not constitute a prior appropriation and shall not give the State of New York and City of New York any superiority of right over the State of New Jersey and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the enjoyment and use of the Delaware River and its tributaries.

3. The prayer of the intervenor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for the present allocation to it of the equivalent of 750 million gallons of water daily from the Delaware River or its Pennsylvania tributaries is denied without prejudice.

4. The prayer of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the appointment of a river master is denied without prejudice.

5. This decree is without prejudice to the United States and particularly is subject to the paramount authority of Congress in respect to navigation and navigable waters of the United States, and subject to the powers of the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers of the United States Army in respect to navigation and navigable waters of the United States.

6. Any of the parties hereto, complainant, defendants or intervenor, may apply at the foot of this decree for other or further action or relief and this Court retains jurisdiction of the suit for the purpose of any order or direction or modification of this decree, or any supplemental decree that it may deem at any time to be proper in relation to the subject matter in controversy.

7. The costs of the cause shall be divided and shall be paid by the parties in the following proportions: State of New Jersey 35 per cent, City of New York 35 per cent, State of New York 15 per cent, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 15 per cent.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State of New Jersey, Plaintiff,

16, Original. vs.

State of New York and City of New York, Defendants,

State of Pennsylvania, Intervenor.

ORDER.

On consideration of the statement by the Special Master of the work done and time employed upon the above entitled cause, it is ordered that his compensation be fixed in the sum of $25,000; to be paid by the parties in the proportions fixed by the decree for the payment of costs.

It is further ordered that the expenses of the Special Master in the sum of $3,283.24 be, and the same are hereby, allowed; and the payment thereof by the parties in the proportions fixed by the decree for the division of costs is hereby confirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

24, Original. On petition for writ of mandamus
Ex Parte: Madden Bros., Inc., and on rule to show cause thereupon
Petitioner. issued.

On consideration of the petition for writ of mandamus herein and of the return of the Honorable Joseph W. Molyneaux to the rule, heretofore issued to him, to show cause why a writ of mandamus should not issue directing and commanding him to vacate, annul, and set aside the order and decree of August 9, 1930, dismissing the bill of complaint in the case of Madden Bros., Inc., vs. The Railroad and Warehouse Commission of the State of Minnesota, et al., and to call to his assistance two other judges and proceed in the said cause according to and in compliance with the provisions of Sec. 266 of the Judicial Code in order to hear and determine the application for an interlocutory injunction in said cause;

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said rule be, and the same is hereby, made absolute.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Minnie D. Smith,
Petitioner,
964 vs.
John B. Daniel.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Minnie D. Smith,
Petitioner,
964 vs.
John B. Daniel.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Claude Nichols,
Petitioner,
966 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Claude Nichols,
Petitioner,
966 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Martin A. Leach,
Appellant,
686 vs.
The People of the State of California.

Appeal from the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, State of California, and on motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank L. Smith, Cicero J. Lindly,
Hal W. Trovillion, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
841 vs.
Illinois Bell Telephone Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and on motion to dismiss or affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New Orleans Land Company,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

842 vs. State of Louisiana.

Board of Levee Commissioners of the

Orleans Levee District.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and on motion to affirm which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

M. J. Loftus, Garfield Moody,

Ben Schultheis, et al.,

Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

854 vs. State of Iowa.

Department of Agriculture of the

State of Iowa, et al., etc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bandini Petroleum Company, et al., It is now here ordered by the Court

Appellants, that further consideration of the motion

852 vs. to dismiss and of the petition for writ

The Superior Court of the State of certiorari be postponed to the hear-

of California, etc. ing of the case on the merits. The case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 5, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Painters District Council No. 14 of Chicago, etc., et al., Appellants,
836 vs.
The United States of America.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
889 vs.
Edward Ryan, Claimant of One Brunswick Bar.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Western Pacific California Railroad Company, Petitioner,
896 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

I. J. Van Huffel, Petitioner,
906 vs.
Trace D. Harkelrode, Treasurer of Trumbull County, Ohio, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Trumbull County, State of Ohio, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

I. J. Van Huffel, Petitioner,
907 vs.
Trace D. Markelrode, Treasurer of Trumbull County, Ohio, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Green Star Steamship Co., Ltd., Petitioner,
931 vs.
Armour & Company, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
935 vs.
The United States of America, ex rel. The Vindicator Consolidated Gold Mining Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
936 vs.
The United States of America, ex rel. Chestatee Pyrites & Chemical Corporation.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
890 vs.
George Anderson.

Further consideration of the petition for certiorari is withheld to await the decision of this Court in No. 889, The United States v. Ryan, Claimant.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles D. Jaffee, Petitioner,
799 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louis J. Jaffee, Petitioner,
800 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Julius Schwartz,

Petitioner,

801 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harry H. Schwartz,

Petitioner,

802 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. C. Austin, Receiver of O. K. Cattle Company, Petitioner,

860 vs.

C. F. Osborne, and J. W. Bailey, Administrator of the Estate of Horace L. Hotchkiss, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert L. McElroy and Lula McElroy,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

861 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Borough of Fort Lee, a Municipal of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

Corporation.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway

Company and E. L. Westbrooke,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

868 vs. to the Supreme Court of the

Orel Bishop, Administratrix of the State of Arkansas.

Estate of B. Bishop, Deceased.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank Dial,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

874 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mississippi Valley Trust Company, as
Administrator of the Estates of
Walter C. Franz, Deceased, et al.,
Petitioners,
878 vs.
Gustavus A. Buder, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hartford Electric Supply Company,
Petitioner,
879 vs.
Joseph Sachs & Colt's Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

H. E. Byram, Mark W. Potter and
Edward J. Brundage, etc.,
Petitioners,
880 vs.
F. M. Miner and Robert J. McDonald, Co-partners, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Seaboard Citizens National
Bank of Norfolk,
Petitioner,
881 vs.
Alan J. Hofheimer, Executor, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cora Ryan, Administratrix of the
Estate of Earl A. Ryan, Deceased,
Petitioner,
882 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe
Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James Kellar, alias James Kirk, etc.,
Petitioner,
883 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Kansas on the relation of Roland Boynton, Attorney General,

Petitioner,

884 vs.

The Board of County Commissioners of Shawnee County, Kansas, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Osaka Shosen Kaisha,

Petitioner,

887 vs.

Olivier Straw Goods Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. W. Dana,

Petitioner,

891 vs.

F. J. Searight, Continental Supply Company, Sun Lumber Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific
Railway Company,
Petitioner,
893 vs.
Harry C. Trout.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Bank of United States,
Petitioner,
894 vs.
Irving Trust Company, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Times Square Auto Supply Co., Inc., Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Albert Pick & Company,
Petitioner,
900 vs.
Peoples Bank of Buffalo, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the County Court of Erie County, State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the County Court of Erie County, State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
903 vs.
William R. Irons.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Standard Oil Company (N.J.),
Petitioner,
908 vs.
Glendola Steamship Corporation,
Claimant of Steamship Glendola, her engines, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the UnitedStates Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Glendola Steamship Corporation,
Petitioner,
909 vs.
Standard Oil Company (N.J.)

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commercial Stevedoring Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
927 vs.
Anna Dowdell, as Administratrix of the goods, chattels and credits and rights of Christopher Dowdell, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

March Haynes, Administrator De Bonis Non of the Estate of Elwood Haynes, Deceased, Petitioner,
928 vs.
Union Carbide and Carbon Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
929 vs.
Luigi Pascucci.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Brief English Systems, Inc.,
Petitioner,
930 vs.
John P. Owen and The Owen Institute of Commerce.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. E. Hedger Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
954 vs.
F. S. Royster Guano Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Hide and Leather Company,
Petitioner,
922 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent to postpone the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause until October 5 next,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Miller, Claimant, etc., Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	Leave was granted to file brief of the respondent by Thursday next on motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.
1000	
Roy Myers, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	Leave was granted to file brief of the respondent by Thursday next on motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.
997	
Joe Davis, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	Leave was granted to file brief of the respondent by Thursday next on motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.
998	

The Solicitor General waived the right to oppose petitions for writs of certiorari in criminal cases docketed up to and including Friday, May 29, next.

ORDER.

The Court directs that all petitions for writs of certiorari in criminal prosecutions filed on or before Friday, May 29, next, to which the Government's waiver applies, shall be deemed to be submitted to the Court at the time of the filing of the petition, and the Clerk is directed thereupon to distribute the petitions and accompanying papers to the members of the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. D. Cummins & Company, Petitioner,
754 vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand to the Court of Claims for further findings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. E. Scott for the petitioner, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent, in opposition thereto, with leave to petitioner to file additional brief on or before Thursday next.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant,
193 vs.
Hal Norwood, Attorney General of the State of Arkansas, etc.

The motion to modify the mandate in this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. White for the appellant.

Iowa Des Moines National Bank, Petitioner,
711 vs.
J. M. Stewart, Chairman, etc.;
Central State Bank, Petitioner,
712 vs.
J. M. Stewart, Chairman, etc.

The motion to substitute Ben B. Dewey as respondent as the successor in office of C. F. Keeling, and to substitute E.R. Bennett as chairman of the Board of Supervisors of Polk County, Iowa, in place of respondent J. M. Stewart was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Rae Williams in behalf of counsel for the petitioners.

Parlex Holding Corporation, Petitioner,
863 vs.
The City of New York.

Leave was granted to file supplemental brief of petitioner and amended remittitur of the Court of Appeals of New York, on motion of Mr. J. S. Easby-Smith in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

Pacific Northwest Canning Company,
Petitioner,
918 vs.
Skookum Packer's Association;
Pacific Northwest Canning Company,
Petitioner,
919 vs.
Skookum Packer's Association.

Leave was granted to file brief of respondent on or before Thursday next on motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. William C. DeLacy for the respondent.

The United States,
Petitioner,
759 vs.
Kirby Lumber Company.

The motion to remand to the Court of Claims for further findings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner, in opposition thereto.

The State of Colorado,
Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
The State of Kansas, et al.

The motion for leave to introduce additional evidence herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long for the defendants in support of the motion, and by Mr. Clarence I. Ireland, Mr. Sidney R. Goldsman, Mr. Fred A. Rubin, Mr. A. Watson MacHendrie, and Mr. Henry C. Vidal for the complainants in opposition thereto.

The United States of America, et al.,
Appellants,
793 vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company,
et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction here was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Elmer B. Collins, Mr. J. Stanley Payne, and Mr. Parker McCollo for the appellants.

A. L. Moye, Appellant, 807 vs. State of North Carolina and Town of Ahoskie.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. McNeill for the appellant.
School District No. 7, Muskogee County, Oklahoma, et al., etc., Appellants, 813 vs. Clarence Hunnicut, County Superintendent, etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. J. Bruce, Mr. J. Bernard Smith and Mr. O. B. Jefferson for the appellants.
The United States of America, Appellant, 815 vs. Harry Murdock.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John Henry McEvers for the appellant.
State Tax Commission of Mississippi, et al., etc., Appellants, 833 vs. Interstate Natural Gas Company, Inc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. A. Lauderdale for the appellants.
James G. Clyne, Appellant, 839 vs. The State of Ohio.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry A. Williams for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Ray T. Miller for the appellee in opposition thereto.
Western and Atlantic Railroad, Appellant, 869 vs. Mrs. Helen H. Gray.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fitzgerald Hall for the appellant.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
943 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank H. Towner, Mr. Alfred P. Thom, Mr. R. M. Van Doren, Mr. Herbert Fitzpatrick, Mr. Ben C. Dey, Mr. Edw. S. Jouett, Mr. L. E. Jeffries, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. R. V. Fletcher, Mr. Geo. F. Brownell, Mr. F. Barron Grier, and Mr. W. R. C. Cocke for the appellants.

A. D. Cummins & Company, Petitioner,
754 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. E. Scott for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

The Rudolph Wurlitzer Company, Petitioner,
845 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert C. Cooley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. M. Sheppard, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Birkel Music Company, Petitioner,
846 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert C. Cooley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. M. Sheppard and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Parlex Holding Corporation,
Petitioner,
863 vs.
The City of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of New York County, State of New York, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin Conboy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly for the respondent.

Meyersdale Fuel Company,
Petitioner,
864 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. Lester Moore and Mr. Frank K. Nebeker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Ralph C. Williamson for the respondent.

Columbia Steel & Shafting Company,
Petitioner,
867 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward B. Burling, Mr. William A. Seifert, and Mr. Newell W. Ellison for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, ~~Mr. Charles R. Pollard~~ and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Benjamin Clayton,
Petitioner,
871 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. C. Fulbright and Mr. John C. White for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Charles R. Pollard and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

P. L. Mann, Petitioner,
875 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash and Mr. Thos. J. Reilly for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

Harvey S. Stewart, Present Sheriff, etc., et al., Petitioners,
902 vs.
Edward Hines Yellow Pine Trustees, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fleet C. Hathorn and Mr. E. C. Sharp for the petitioners, and by Mr. Wm. S. Bennett, Mr. T. W. Davis and Mr. T. J. Wills for the respondents.

Edward E. Marshall, Petitioner,
904 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Edmund Burke and Mr. Lucius Q. C. Lamar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Whitney North Seymour and Mr. E. C. Finney for the respondent.

Crimora Manganese Corporation, et al., Petitioners,
905 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Edmund Burke and Mr. Lucius Q. C. Lamar for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Whitney North Seymour and Mr. E. C. Finney for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Pacific Gas and Electric Company. 913

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, and Mr. Aubrey Lawrence for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. B. Bosley for the respondent.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 914

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William B. Bosley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Frank B. Campbell. 915

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. W. Clifton Stone, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. David F. Lee for the respondent.

Charles Hazlitt Cahan, Jr., Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 916

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Webster for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Chicago & North Western Railway Company,
Petitioner,
917 vs.
Eugene Bolle.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, Second District, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roy H. Van Doren and Mr. Samuel H. Cady for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph D. Ryan for the respondent.

Pacific Northwest Canning Company,
Petitioner,
918 vs.
Skookum Packers' Association;
Pacific Northwest Canning Company,
Petitioner,
919 vs.
Skookum Packers' Association.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Townsend and Mr. Wm. A. Loftus for the petitioner, and by Mr. Karl Fenning, Mr. Eugene E. Stevens and Mr. William C. DeLacy for the respondent.

Taylor Oil & Gas Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
920 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Shelley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. S. Dee Hanson for the respondent.

Gust Gerling, Petitioner,
923 vs.
Fred J. Dankers, as Executor, etc.;
Gust Gerling, Petitioner,
924 vs.
Fred J. Dankers, as Executor, etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Willis E. Reed and Mr. Frank E. Edgerton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ora S. Spillman for the respondents.

Wabash Railway Company,
Petitioner,
925 vs.
Harvey E. Lindley.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer Hall, Mr. Nat S. Brown, and Mr. F. D. McKenney for the petitioner, and by Mr. John G. Parkinson for the respondent.

Art Metal Construction Company,
Petitioner,
932 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dana B. Hellings for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe for the respondent.

Henry C. Zeller and Edward G. Zeller,
Petitioners,
933 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dana B. Hellings for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe for the respondent.

Robert Gordon Duncan,
Petitioner,
937 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. C. Lewis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Chas. H. Weston, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Henry A. Schweinhaut, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
939 vs.
Delia Flaherty.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Merillat for the petitioner.

Ballard Brothers Fish Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
940 vs.
Percy S. Stephenson, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. J. McCumber for the petitioners, and by Mr. Tazewell Taylor, Mr. James Mann, and Mr. S. Heath Tyler for the respondents.

James W. Merkle, Petitioner,
941 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Halle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. A. W. Henderson, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Helen Lay, Lumbermen's Reciprocal Association, etc., et al., Petitioners,
942 vs.
E. Forrest Mitchell, as Insurance Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marshall B. Woodworth for the petitioners.

Niagara Falls Gas and Electric Light Company, Petitioner,
946 vs.
William A. Prendergast, et al., etc.;
U. S. Light & Heat Corporation, et al., Petitioners,
947 vs.
William A. Prendergast, et al., etc.;
City of Niagara Falls, New York, Petitioner,
948 vs.
U. S. Light & Heat Corporation.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry D. Williams and Mr. Lawrence G. Williams for the petitioner in No. 946; by Mr. Alan V. Parker for the petitioner in No. 947; by Mr. Basil Robillard for the petitioners in No. 948; and by Mr. Charles G. Blakeslee for the respondents in Nos. 946 and 947, and by Mr. John J. Bennett, Jr., for the respondents in Nos. 947 and 948.

Frank Shore, Petitioner,
951 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Leahy and Mr. James F. Reilly for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Henry H. Cross Company, Petitioner,
957 vs.
Wilson Rice, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lewis L. Dent for the petitioner, and by ~~Mr. Ben H. Heaton and~~ Mr. Dan C. Flanagan for the respondent.

W. W. Davis and George Ferguson, Petitioners,
960 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. Cleveland Davis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Brown's "Shamrock" Linens, Ltd., Petitioner,
969 vs.
Frank C. Bowers, as Executor, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas G. Haight and Mr. Robert H. Montgomery for the petitioner and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. W. Cutler Thompson, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Louis Bonamico, alias Louis Toriana, Petitioner,
977 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Bonamico pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Gong Bell Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
982 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of

the Court by Mr. Ferdinand Tannenbaum and Mr. Mark Eisner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John H. McEvers for the respondent.

General Talking Pictures Corporation and DeForest Phonofilms, Inc., Petitioners,
986 vs.
The Stanley Company of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of

the Court by Mr. Samuel E. Darby, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles Neave for the respondent.

P. W. Darling, Petitioner,
995 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Winston Read for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

Roy Myers,	Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari
997 vs.		herein to the United States Circuit
The United States of America.		Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Raymond Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Joe Davis,	Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari
998 vs.		herein to the United States Circuit
The United States of America.		Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hiram P. Whitacre for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

William Miller, Claimant, etc.,		The petition for a writ of certiorari
	Petitioner,	herein to the United States Circuit
1000 vs.		Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit
The United States of America.		was submitted to the consideration of

the Court by Mr. Louis Halle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Raymond M. Hudson and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Albert B. Fall,	Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari
1007 vs.		herein to the Court of Appeals of the
The United States of America.		District of Columbia was submitted pur-

suant to the order of this Court to its consideration by Mr. Frank J. Hogan, Mr. Wilton J. Lambert and Mr. William E. Leahy for the petitioner.

J. E. Lane,	Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari
1011 vs.		herein to the United States Circuit
The United States of America.		Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

was submitted pursuant to the order of this Court to its consideration by Mr. E. Howard McCaleb, Jr., for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, June 1, next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JUNE 1, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Percy W. Phillips, It is ordered that Pierre A. Fontaine, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gustave A. Iverson, It is ordered that Charles W. Dunn, Esquire, of Logan, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul D. Miller, It is ordered that Howard E. Wahrenbrock, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank J. Hogan, It is ordered that John D. Rhodes, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph B. Fleharty, It is ordered that Horace London, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that Ralph M. Lucas, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright, It is ordered that Robert Fosdick, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert G. Simmons, It is ordered that E. E. Danly, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Sisson, It is ordered that Howard Mackay, Esquire, of Hackensack, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph B. Fleharty, It is ordered that Holmes Hall, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Sisson, It is ordered that George W. Babcock, Esquire, of Hackensack, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Mr. Attorney General Mitchell addressed the Court as follows:

"*May it please the court:*

"During the December recess of this Court members of its Bar assembled here to express their profound regret at the death of William Howard Taft, tenth Chief Justice of the United States, and to make a permanent record of their high regard for his devoted public service. That gathering included many men, themselves distinguished for public service, lifelong friends of the late Chief Justice, who paid eloquent and loving tribute to his memory. A minute was prepared, reviewing the principal events of his career, and the following resolutions were adopted:

"'William Howard Taft was born in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, September 15, 1857. He was graduated with distinction at Yale University in 1878 and at the Cincinnati Law School in 1880. He was called to public service within a year after his admission to the bar, first as Assistant Prosecuting Attorney at Hamilton County, Ohio, and then as Assistant County Solicitor. In 1887 he was appointed by Governor Foraker to succeed Hon. Judson Harmon as judge of the Superior Court of Cincinnati. Three years later, in 1890, he was appointed by President Harrison Solicitor General of the United States. After two years' service in that office he was appointed Circuit Judge of the United States for the Sixth Judicial Circuit. His three years' service in the Ohio State Court had given Mr. Taft not only an insight into the interest and importance of the judicial office, but had awakened in him a love of the judicial function which deeply marked his character and colored his entire future career. He threw himself with ardor into the varied work of a federal circuit judge, which at that period required him to sit in courts of first instance, at law and in equity, and even on the criminal side, as well as to participate with his associates in the appellate work which the Evarts Act of 1890 devolved upon the newly created Circuit Court of Appeals, a jurisdiction which in a large and important class of cases was final. By his learning and industry, his keen sense of values, his broad human understanding and his appreciation of the supreme importance of the administration of justice, Judge Taft soon established a high reputation as one of the ablest members of the federal judiciary. In the year 1896 Judge Taft, in connection with Judson Harmon, Lawrence Maxwell, and others, reorganized the Cincinnati Law School, adopted the Harvard case book method of teaching, and started it upon a career of enlarged activity. He accepted the position of dean, as well as lecturer on real property law, and discharged the duties of both those positions until his resignation from the bench in 1900.

"'When the termination of the war with Spain left the United States with the responsibility for the future of the Philippine Islands, President McKinley called upon Judge Taft to head a commission of distinguished Americans to proceed to those islands, study the conditions prevailing in them, and make a report with recommendations as to the future relations of the Government of the United States to those islands and their people. There was little in his assignment which appealed to a Federal judge devoted to his judicial work and ardently believing that the administration of justice was the supreme concern of mankind. But the appointment was tendered him by the President as a call to public duty, and such an appeal never was made to him in vain. At the conclusion of the work of the Philippine Commission Mr. Taft was appointed first civil governor of the islands, serving in that capacity until February 1, 1904, when he was appointed Secretary of War in the Cabinet of President Roosevelt, from which he resigned in June, 1908, because of his impending nomination for the Presidency, to which he was elected in November of that year. Space is lacking here for an appraisal of the value of the distinguished public service rendered by Mr. Taft as civil governor of the Philippines, as Secretary of War, or as President of the United States. But it is peculiarly appropriate to this occasion to note that few Presidents, if any, have been called upon to appoint so large a number of Federal judges as he, and by none was a higher standard of learning and personal character required in his nominees. During

his four years of the presidency he selected five Associate Justices and one Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. The choice of the Chief Justice gave him more anxious thought than any other. Departing from precedents, he nominated to the chief justiceship an associate justice of the court, Edward D. White, of Louisiana, who also was a Democrat and a former Confederate soldier. This nomination was promptly confirmed by the Senate and met with universal approval on the part of the bar and the people of the country. It had been Mr. Taft's greatest ambition himself to become Chief Justice, and in selecting Judge White for that position he was putting another man into the only post in the Government he had ever really yearned to fill. On June 21, 1921, President Harding appointed Mr. Taft Chief Justice to succeed Chief Justice White, who had died a month earlier, and on the retirement of Chief Justice Taft himself, very shortly before his death, President Hoover appointed as his successor Charles Evans Hughes, whom President Taft had appointed an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court in 1910 (and who had resigned to accept the Republican nomination for the Presidency in 1916).

"'Mr. Taft is the only American in our history who was the head of two of the three equal and coordinate branches of our Government. But the bench was his career of predilection and he brought to the office of Chief Justice devotion to and enthusiasm in its work, as well as the experience of his long, useful, and varied life in the public service. Aside from his strictly judicial work, the two outstanding events in the history of the court during his incumbency are (1) the passage of the act which greatly limited the number of appeals as of right to the Supreme Court from the final decisions of the Circuit Courts of Appeals, substituting for the right of appeal a discretionary power of review by writ of certiorari, and (2) the enactment by Congress of a law authorizing the construction of a building in which to house the Court and its offices, and the passage of appropriations adequate for the construction of a dignified and beautiful structure, the selection of a site, and the preparation and approval of the plans for the building. To the securing of both of these measures and the planning of the new court building, the Chief Justice devoted much thought and energy, appearing in person before the appropriate congressional committees to fully present all the reasons which had made him an advocate of those measures. His work on the court as reflected in his opinions speaks for itself. The number of opinions he wrote was surprisingly large, and the vigor, clarity, and sureness of touch which they express demonstrate his unquestioned title to a place high in the ranks of the leaders in the American judiciary. This brief sketch of the Chief Justice would be incomplete without an allusion to those personal qualities which endeared him to many people of high and low degree throughout the land. In the truest sense of the word he was a great humanitarian, feeling the keenest sense of sympathy and interest in all that concerned men of all sorts and condition. He truly loved his fellows. He had compassion even for the erring. He found something good in everybody, but no mere sentimentality ever clouded his judgment or stayed the impetuous vigor of his condemnation of dishonesty or mere pretense. Not less characteristic than his broad sympathy was his genial and rescuing sense of humor. Sentiment balanced by humor produced in him a rare sanity of judgment and added to his great gifts of character and intellect the charm of a gracious and winsome personality.

"'*It is now resolved*, That the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States do hereby record their high appreciation of the long record of devoted and effective service rendered by William Howard Taft to the people of the United States in the many public employments to which he was called, and especially in the exalted office of Chief Justice of the United States.

"'*Further resolved*, That the Attorney General be asked to present these resolutions to the Court and to request that they be inscribed upon its permanent records. And that the chairman of this meeting be requested to transmit a copy of the resolutions to the family of the late Chief Justice, together with the assurance of the sincere sympathy of the Bar in the great and irremediable loss they have sustained.'

"In obedience to those resolutions I am here to present them and ask that they be entered in the records of the Court.

"Chief Justice Taft was my good friend, and I am grateful for the tradition which gives to the office I hold the high privilege of representing the Bar on this occasion.

"The only man to hold the two greatest offices in the gift of the American people, he had a public career unparalleled in its variety, with great distinction as a teacher, a colonial administrator, and executive, but it is fitting in memorial exercises by the members of the profession which he loved, and for the archives of this Court, that we speak chiefly of his service to the Court and to the cause of justice, and first of that part of his work recorded in the official reports.

"During his service as Chief Justice the Court delivered fifteen hundred and ninety-six (1,596) opinions. One-ninth of that number is one hundred and seventy-seven. He delivered two hundred and fifty-three opinions for the Court, or one-sixth of the total. The nature of the cases and the labor required in each would have to be examined to judge accurately of his relative efforts, but he did his share.

"This is not the occasion to review his judicial opinions at length, but a study of them reveals these things. His public life and experience as an administrator and executive had developed a wisdom and common sense which are disclosed in these writings. His opinions are of the kind which are useful to lawyers. They not only decided the cases presented but they are charts for the future. The style is simple and direct, and he never clouded his thought by self-consciousness in expression. His judgments disclose prodigious energy expended in study and research.

"In assigning cases to members of the Court for preparation of opinions he gave to himself at least an equal share of those dull ones which were interspersed with the important matters before the Court. He seemed to take a special interest in patent and trade-mark cases. He had an unusual facility in that field, and wrote many fine opinions in important patent litigation. It is in constitutional law that his greatest judicial work was done. Of his two hundred and fifty-three opinions seventy dealt with important constitutional questions. That in the Myers case, settling a controversy as old as the Union, respecting the President's exclusive power of removing executive officers, alone would mark him a great constitutional lawyer. The opinions he delivered from this bench, together with two hundred and four others, rendered during his service as a United States Circuit Judge, form an enduring monument to his high judicial qualities.

"Beyond his performance of the routine tasks of a Chief Justice is other service for which we should be grateful.

"When he began his work here as Chief Justice the Court was eighteen months behind in disposing of the cases before it. He took a leading part in devising and procuring the passage by Congress of the act of February 13, 1925, which gave the Court a wide discretion to decide what cases should be brought before it for review, and with that change in procedure as a starting point he and his associates set about the task of bringing the work up to date with such determination and driving force that at the end of his service as Chief Justice in February, 1930, the business of the Court was practically current, and with the completion of that task during the past year it may no longer be said that appeals to this Court are a means of delaying justice or allowing criminals to postpone punishment. Under his leadership this Court has set an example to the courts of the land, and brought home to the profession that it should no longer be taken for granted that courts must always be behind in their work.

"During his incumbency Congress enacted the laws authorizing the construction of a building to be occupied by the Court and its officers. He had largely to do with that and gave constant thought and effort to obtaining the necessary appropriations, acquiring the site, and above all in seeing to it that the building when completed shall be a dignified and beautiful structure. This project was dear to his heart, and we regret that he did not live to see the fulfillment of his efforts. The new Supreme Court building when completed will itself be a memorial of one of his services to the Court.

"He had much to do with the enactment of the law authorizing the judicial conference presided over by the Chief Justice and attended by the senior circuit judges of the ten judicial circuits, which annually considers the operation of our Federal judicial system for the purpose of bringing about administrative and legislative changes to increase efficiency in the administration of justice.

"By his influence for a high standard in judicial appointments he rendered inestimable service to the cause of justice. As President he appointed five associate justices and one Chief Justice of this Court and many judges of the other Federal courts. He spoke of this Court as the chief bulwark of the institutions of civil liberty created by the Constitution, and viewed the appointment of members of the Court as the most sacred duty with which he, as President, was charged. During all his public career, in whatever office he held, his influence was exerted to elevate the standards for judicial appointments and to combat the pressure of political expediency for the selection of mediocre men.

"With all the other demands upon him, he took time to see old friends, to find new ones, to address gatherings of his fellow citizens, and to make those many public appearances expected of one in his position. His big, warm personality, kindliness, and humor, with that infectious chuckle of his, will never be forgotten by those who knew him.

"None of our institutions is so impregnable that popular confidence in and respect for it are not to be desired, and it is well for this Court and for the constitutional rights and liberties which it guards, each time there is chosen for Chief Justice one who in the public estimation is so preeminently fitted that his appointment is generally acclaimed. Chief Justice Taft had that fortunate distinction. What training for this high office could have excelled his! From early youth he was continuously in the public service. Within a year after his admission to the Bar he became prosecuting attorney of his county, then judge of a Superior Court. Forty-one years ago, in this very spot where I now stand, he commenced his service for the Nation, as Solicitor General of the United States, and with but a short interlude continued in the nation's service until he ended it, again in this room as Chief Justice of the United States. From Solicitor General to United States Circuit Judge, then president of the Philippine Commission, civil governor of the Philippine Islands, special representative of his Government on delicate diplomatic missions, Secretary of War, and President. What a preparation for high judicial office! When finally the opportunity came to place him on this Court the whole nation knew that he was qualified by character, learning, and experience. It trusted him and believed in his judicial qualities and in his big-hearted understanding of the problems of plain people.

"He had always yearned for service on this Court. His was a judicial mind. Political life was not congenial to him but fate seemed bound to draw him against his will into the field of political and executive action. It has been said that because of his judicial instincts it was hard for him to adjust himself to the thoughts and feelings and methods of political life in a party sense. Nevertheless, twice he regretfully refused appointment as an Associate Justice of this Court because he felt he could not desert administrative responsibilities.

"He made no secret of his interest in judicial work. Millions of his fellow countrymen knew of these things and sympathized with his aspirations. They held him in affectionate regard. When in 1912 his party, torn by dissension, went down to defeat and he failed of reelection to the Presidency, his lack of bitterness or rancor, his smiling acceptance of his defeat, his frank and humorous public statement that he had retired from the Presidency with the full consent of the American people, met with instant response in the public mind, and from that moment, to an extraordinary degree, he found a place in the affections of the Nation. So when he came at last to the great office of Chief Justice he had the entire confidence and respect of great numbers of his fellow citizens. He held them to the end. His very presence on this Court quickened public interest in its functions, strengthened it in the public regard, and helped to maintain it as the bulwark of the Constitution."

The Chief Justice said:

"Mr. Attorney General, in receiving the resolutions which you have presented we recognize that of all the tributes that have been paid to the memory of this eminent statesman and jurist there could be none which would have been more highly prized by him than this tribute coming from the profession which he loved in recognition of the distinction of his service to the cause which was nearest to his heart.

"Blessed by forbears who had achieved high repute by virtue of eminent talent and public spirit, it may be said that William Howard Taft was born to the purple of the highest advantages which our democracy affords. It was natural that his winning personality, giving play to marked ability, without suggestion of condescension, and distinguished by a nobility of character which scorned all that was sordid, base, or narrow, should have opened early the door of opportunity for public service. The gracious leadership of his youth in the circle of the university prefigured the position which he at once took at the junior bar, and after showing his mettle in his native city as prosecutor and judge, he came, at the age of thirty-three, to the office of Solicitor General of the United States. From that time until his death he exemplified in varied undertakings of grave responsibility the finest type of public servant and enjoyed an increasing general esteem, until, in the closing years, after the wounds of political strife had been healed and the victories of a magnanimous spirit had been acclaimed, he was enriched beyond any man of his time with the wealth of universal affection.

"In other places there have been, and will be, appropriate appreciation of his services as the representative of his country in novel and important duties as executive head of the new government in the Philippines, and as Secretary of War and Chief Magistrate of the Republic. It is for us to recognize with gratitude, and with a deep sense of obligation and of loss, his labors in this Court, which brought his career to the fullness of illustrious accomplishment.

"Chief Justice Taft came to this service with a prestige which added weight to his pronouncements. But in the realm of lofty and conspicuous endeavor, success is never guaranteed by past achievements. It must be rewon daily, and even the highest prestige is put to fresh proof by the inescapable responsibilities of decision. Chief Justice Taft entered the Court with a distinguished reputation, but he left it with an even greater fame securely established.

"This was due to his special qualifications for judicial office, by virtue of training, aptitude, and temperament. His training began, as I have said, almost as soon as he was admitted to the bar. When he took executive office at the age of forty-three he had served nearly eleven years upon the bench and for eight of these years as United States Circuit Judge. In that work he was indefatigable, not only in the Circuit Court of Appeals but at trial terms. One who knew intimately his labors in those days has said that Judge Taft became known to the bar of his circuit as no other circuit judge had ever been before or has been since. Nor was he content with the range of his judicial duty, but in his enthusiasm for legal study he took a leading part in law school organization and teaching. The learning and strength of his judicial opinions as a Circuit Judge made him widely known. His interest was not simply in the right adjudication of particular cases, but in jurisprudence, and he consistently labored in the interest of system and coherence. It was his effort to master the special subject in hand so as to utilize it in giving a chart for the future. A conspicuous instance of this is his opinion for the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Sixth Circuit in Addyston Pipe & Steel Company *v.* United States, delivered in 1898 (85 Fed. 271), containing what was, at that time, perhaps the most thorough exposition in the American reports of the law relating to restraint of trade. The judicial service of his young manhood was rendered with a zest which never abated. And his duties and experiences in executive office heightened for him the never-failing charm of the judicial career, by reason of its independence and impartiality, and its devotion to what he believed to be the paramount interests of the administration of justice. Having begun as a student of the law, he returned to his legal studies when released from executive responsibilities, and as a lecturer on constitutional law he completed his preparation for the great task to which manifest destiny was to call him.

"To Chief Justice Taft, the administration of justice was never an abstract conception, to be extolled in vain phrases and with but slight regard to changes in social conditions and to existing deficiencies. While holding in contempt the fanciful schemes with which the administration of justice in this country is threatened from time to time he was ever pointing out its shortcomings and laboring for its improvement by practicable remedies. It was this concern which gave him a peculiar sensitiveness with respect to the qualifications for judicial office. He realized profoundly that the chief defects of the administration of justice lie in men rather than in method. A good judge, using the means of the com-

of an alert and informed mind, will find but rarely that he can not force his way through to effective action. No duty seemed to President Taft more important than that of selecting federal judges. It was his special concern while he had the responsibility of appointment, and his solicitude continued and was constantly expressed after he became Chief Justice. It has fallen to but three Presidents since Washington to appoint a majority of the members of this Court. President Jackson appointed Chief Justice Taney and four Associate Justices. President Lincoln apopinted Chief Justice Chase and four Associate Justices. President Taft appointed Chief Justice White and five Associate Justices. In no act of Mr. Taft's career was his estimate of the requirements of judicial office and his emphasis upon its proper independence of partisan considerations more strikingly shown than in his appointment of Chief Justice White, of a different political faith, but who had represented upon the bench the highest standards of judicial conduct. And we are admonished of the rapidity of the changes in this Court, despite the apparent permanence afforded by the tenure of office, when we reflect that when Chief Justice Taft came to the bench ten years ago only two of his appointees were still in service.

"No learning or information comes amiss to a Justice of this Court. Its members have been drawn from many fields of activity, and to its conferences are brought the wisdom derived from varied experiences in different parts of our land. By reason of the variety and importance of his previous official duties, Chief Justice Taft had in this respect an unusual equipment. The learning and industry of the judge was reenforced by the special knowledge gained in statecraft. He had abundant opportunity to apply this knowledge, and it was applied with judicial independence. As illustrating this, and also as exhibiting the quality of his judicial opinions, reference may be made to Balzac *v.* Porto Rico (258 U. S. 298) and Yu Cong Eng *v.* Trinidad (271 U. S. 500), dealing with fundamental questions relating to the administration of our insular possessions; to Stafford *v.* Wallace (258 U. S. 495), sustaining and construing the Packers and Stockyards Act; to Ex parte Grossman (267 U. S. 87), upholding the power of the President to pardon criminal contempts; and to Myers *v.* United States (272 U. S. 52), sustaining the President's power of removal.

Because of the interest which he had shown throughout his public life in the problems affecting labor, Mr. Taft was appointed, when the United States entered the War in 1917, cochairman of the War Labor Board. And when he came to this Court no one had a more intimate knowledge of labor conditions in this country or was more highly respected by all those concerned in industry, whether as employers, managers, or employees. There can be no doubt of his special interest in the decisions of this Court affecting labor questions, and upon these questions he delivered many of the Court's most important opinions; as, for example, in American Steel Foundries *v.* Tri-City Central Trades Council (257 U. S. 184); in United States Mine Workers *v.* Coronado Coal Company (259 U. S. 344 and 268 U. S. 295); in the Pennsylvania Railroad Company Cases relating to the function of the United States Railroad Labor Board (261 U. S. 172 and 267 U. S. 203); and in Charles Wolff Packing Company *v.* Industrial Court of Kansas (262 U. S. 522) with respect to the extent of the authority of the State in the regulation of wages in industry.

"Chief Justice Taft had also the technical knowledge and aptitude which gave him a special interest and authority in patent cases, and his skill in this difficult branch of jurisprudence is illustrated in such leading opinions as those in Eibel Process Company *v.* Minnesota & Ontario Paper Company (261 U. S. 45) and Corona Cord Tire Company *v.* Dovan Chemical Corporation (276 U. S. 358). The Chief Justice always had an open mind with respect to the necessary adaptation of the authority of government, especially in relation to the broadening requirements of interstate commerce under modern conditions. This was conspicuously shown in the opinions that he delivered for the Court as to the power given

to the Interstate Commerce Commission by the Transportation Act of 1920, among which may be noted, as of permanent importance because of the principles definitely established, those in the cases of Railroad Commission of Wisconsin v. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company (257 U. S. 563), relating to the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission over intrastate rates, and Dayton-Goose Creek Railway Company v. United States (263 U. S. 456), with respect to the recapture provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. To the growing volume of jurisprudence dealing with controversies between States, he made a notable contribution, especially in the case of the Chicago Drainage Canal (278 U. S. 367) and in that of North Dakota v. Minnesota which clearly laid down the essential bases for recovery by one State claiming injury by reason of operations conducted by another. I have not attempted the impossible task of making, upon such an occasion as this, a comprehensive survey or even a just estimate of the judicial service of the late Chief Justice, and I have sought to cite but a few of the many important opinions in which he touched every department of the law as laid down by this Court and which stand as imperishable memorials to his ability and conscientious labor.

"Chief Justice Taft had, as has well been said, 'an almost religious reverence' for the fundamental principles of our system of government. To quote his own words: 'In the Federal Constitution there were embodied two great principles, first, that the Government should be a representative popular government, in which every class in society, the members of which have intelligence to know what will benefit them, is given a voice in selecting the representatives who are to carry on the government and in determining its general policy. On the other hand, the same constitution exalts the personal rights and opportunities of the individual and prescribes the judicial machinery for their preservation, against the infringement by the majority of the electorate in whose hands was placed the direction of the executive and legislative branches of the government.' That was his confession of faith. And he had no sympathy with any attempt to undermine the fundamental protection of fair individual opportunity upon the assumption that social riches could be gained through individual impoverishment. He stood emphatically for the limitations of government under the Constitution and was unwilling to see these limitations exceeded even when legislative phrases were used which would otherwise have been appropriate to the exercise of legislative power. This was conspicuously shown by his opinion in delivering the judgment of the Court holding invalid the child labor tax law (259 U. S. 20) as infringing upon the reserved power of the States. 'To give any such magic,' he said, as was sought to be attributed, 'to the word "tax" would be to break down all constitutional limitation of the powers of Congress and completely wipe out the sovereignty of the States.' But he did not regard the country, as he expressed it, as 'tied to the defects of the past or present,' and he looked for a sure progress through discriminating and far-sighted legislators and through judges of broad vision but imbued with the spirit of the Constitution.

"Chief Justice Taft rarely dissented. In the multitude of cases to which you have referred, Mr. Attorney General, which were decided during his incumbency, I find but seventeen in which he expressed dissent and in but three of these did he write the dissenting opinion.

"Deeply concerned with improvements in administration the Chief Justice gave special attention to his own duty as administrator. Even the distinction of his contribution to the jurisprudence of the Court does not obscure, but throws into a stronger light, by reason of his versatility, his preeminence in the executive department of its work. In the successful endeavor to end the delays which bring such a deserved reproach upon judicial procedure, he was ever a leader, and he would have been the first to recognize the able support which he received from his colleagues in this effort. It was not a vain attempt to bring the Court up to its work by a spasmodic activity, but the intelligent formulation of a plan which receiving the sanction of Congress has put the Court, we trust permanently, upon a basis by which it can keep abreast of the demands upon it. So long as we follow the example which he has set and avail ourselves of the opportunity which his leadership provided, the delays of justice will have no countenance or illustration here.

"But the Chief Justice was not content with expediting the work of this Court. He felt a special responsibility with respect to the entire Federal judicial system. Many years before he came to this bench he had suggested that either the Supreme Court or the Chief Justice should have an adequate executive force to keep current watch upon the business awaiting dispatch in all the districts and circuits of the United States and to make a periodical estimate of the number of judges needed in the various districts and to make the requisite assignments. In a different manner, it was sought to attain the object he had in view by the establishment, in 1922, through his persistence, of the Judicial Conference of the Senior Circuit Judges, held annually, at which the Chief Justice of this Court presides, and which considers the needs of judicial service in the different districts and makes recommendations accordingly. This is an instrumentality of great value, and what it has accomplished and the promise of what it may achieve are due in the largest measure to the foresight and intelligent guidance of Chief Justice Taft.

"No appreciation of the late Chief Justice can stop with appraisal of his intellectual power, or his juristic and executive achievements, or his moral worth. The glow of his warm heart shone through all his activities and irradiated all his associations. As with every virile character, he had ardent sympathies and strong dislikes. But he could not cherish ill will or long harbor a sense of injury. He carried with him an invincible armor of kindliness against which the shafts of opponents had proved harmless. With him, service in the temple of justice was not an austere performance, with the ill-grace of an unnatural aloofness, but a necessary human endeavor, with the dignity of lofty purpose, but pursued with a benignity and an affection for his fellows which made his presence in that temple a constant benediction.

"I should, in these last words, permit those to speak who were associated with him in this work, and I can do no better than to quote what they said to him upon his retirement: 'You came to us from achievements in other fields, and with the prestige of the illustrious place that you lately had held, and you showed in a new form your voluminous capacity for work and for getting work done, your humor that smoothed the rough places, your golden heart that has brought you love from every side, and, most of all, from your brethren whose tasks you have made happy and light.'

"There are those here who have witnessed these memorial exercises in honor of three Chief Justices. In the midst of our efforts, engrossed with present demands, we are moving with a steady and inescapable progress toward the inevitable end. The figures of to-day, like those of yesterday, will soon be replaced, and the best endeavors, striking as they may be in their immediate aspect, will soon form but the background of another picture. Without illusion, and with steady will, we continue in our task, heartened by the exemplars of our faith, among whom no one has a more inspiring or abiding influence than that of the late Chief Justice."

Mr. Attorney General Mitchell addressed the Court as follows:

"*May it please the Court:*

"On the very day of the death of the late Chief Justice, Edward Terry Sanford, Associate Justice, was suddenly stricken and died. Representatives of the Bar, gathered to pay reverent tribute to his memory, adopted resolutions, which it is now my privilege to present to the Court with the request that they be entered in its records as a token of the high esteem in which Justice Sanford was held by the legal profession.

"'*Resolved*, That the members of the Bar of the Supreme Court desire to express their profound regret at the death of Edward Terry Sanford, late Justice of the Supreme Court, and to record their high appreciation of his life and character and of his conspicuous and faithful service to his country. He was born on July 23, 1865, in the State of Tennessee. He graduated from the University of Tennessee and then entered Harvard College, where he continued his studies; later on, studying in European universities and at the Harvard Law School. He became a member of the Bar of the State of Tennessee and practiced at Knoxville and throughout the State until the year 1907, when he became one of the Assistant Attorneys General of the United States. After a year in Wash-

ington he accepted the office of United States District Judge for the Middle and Eastern Districts of Tennessee. He served as such District Judge for fifteen years with marked ability and with the love and respect of the bar and community. He gave much of his time to the cause of education; was chairman of the board of trustees of the George Peabody College for Teachers; also trustee of the University of Tennessee. He was at one time president of the Alumni Association of the University of Tennessee and, later, president of the Alumni Association of Harvard College. In the year 1923 President Harding named him as Justice of the Supreme Court to fill the vacancy arising upon the resignation of Justice Pitney. He served on this Court with great distinction from the time of his qualification until his untimely death on the 8th day of March, 1930, at the early age of sixty-four. He had a personality of unusual charm and was a most gifted speaker. He was a lover of literature and the arts, was widely read, and deeply experienced in law and jurisprudence. He had ardent patriotism and a high sense of public duty. His work upon the Supreme Court was thorough, conscientious, and exacting, and had the high commendation of his associates and of the Bar. His death is his country's loss, and is mourned by the great circle of his friends and associates both upon the bench and at the bar.

"'*Resolved also*, That the Attorney General be asked to present these resolutions to the Court and to request that they be inscribed upon its permanent records, and that the chairman of this meeting be requested to transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the late Justice with an expression of our sincere sympathy in their bereavement.'

"Justice Sanford's career in the public service had its beginning in the suggestion by Mr. Justice McReynolds, then an Assistant Attorney General of the United States, that he be retained by the Government in the investigation of the Fertilizer Trust in 1905. The marked ability disclosed in that case secured him immediate recognition and resulted in his appointment in 1907 to the position of Assistant Attorney General. While occupying that post he appeared before this Court on several occasions and make a favorable impression by the skill and force with which he presented the cases entrusted to him. He attracted the favorable attention of President Roosevelt, and in 1908 was appointed to be United States District Judge for the Eastern and Middle Districts of Tennessee. He had hoped to have the post of Solicitor General, and accepted the judicial office with some reluctance, not realizing that he had been set upon the path that would lead him to the highest honor open to a member of his profession.

"During the last forty-five years those appointed United States District Judges have averaged forty-nine years of age when appointed. Judge Sanford was forty-three when he became a District Judge. His case is an example of the gain to the judicial service in appointing to the lower federal courts comparatively young men, of character and education, through the opportunities for distinguished judicial careers thus opened up to them.

"His service as a trial judge was one of exacting labor, rendered more than usually arduous by a temperament which demanded that every case be given the most careful and painstaking consideration regardless of its material importance. While at the bar he had shown a marked preference for practice before appellate courts, the quick and undeliberated decisions necessary in trial work being repugnant to his scholarly and rather cautious nature. For the same reason his duties as a District Judge were not entirely congenial to him, since he was constantly faced with the necessity of passing immediately upon questions to which he would have preferred to give more mature consideration.

"Nevertheless, his preferences in no way influenced his achievements, and his record was an enviable one. The high regard in which he was held by those with whom he was associated was made evident by the spontaneous outburst of approval with which they responded to the proposal that he be elevated to the Supreme Court. When the retirement of Mr. Justice Pitney, on December 1, 1922, created a vacancy, the Senate of the State of Tennessee adopted a resolution urging that Judge Sanford be considered for the position, and the overwhelming indorsement then given him by the people from his section of the country, coupled with the desire which had always been his to become a member of an appellate tribunal, must have made his selection for the supreme bench doubly gratifying to

"During the seven years of his service as a Justice of the Supreme Court he delivered the opinion of the Court in 120 cases. These opinions, which are to be found in volumes 261 to 281, inclusive, of the Reports, disclose his scholarly training. In addition to his technical equipment he had that culture and breadth of vision so valuable in high judicial office. His professional learning was supplemented by an intimate familiarity with literature, which gave to his judicial opinions an unusual clarity and attractive style. Endowed by nature with the rare gift of felicitous expression, which he used to such good advantage at the bar, he could not be satisfied with a judicial utterance until it had been subjected to careful scrutiny to the end that the exposition of his views and the process of reasoning upon which they were founded might be full and lucid. His judicial labors were characterized by patient and conscientious deliberation upon every aspect of the case in hand. Fidelity to duty was ever his chief concern.

"His judicial opinions cover most of the branches of the law with which this Court is called upon to deal. Those in the Pocket Veto Case in the 279th, and in the Gitlow and Fiske cases in the 268th and 274th, which dealt with the constitutional validity of State statutes defining criminal anarchy, are examples of the excellence of his judicial work.

"All of his writings indicate a marked adherence to the principles on which our Constitution is based, coupled with an appreciation of the need of adjusting the application of those principles to fit the requirements of changing conditions. Conservative in judgment and strict in his adherence to tested doctrines, he was one of that great body of jurists who have maintained the stability of the common-law system of jurisprudence.

"No tribute to Justice Sanford, however brief, would be complete which touched only upon his professional achievements. His early studies, supplemented by foreign travel, bred in him an enduring appreciation of music, literature, and the fine arts. He was in every sense a man of the highest culture. His mastery of the English language and his training in the field of advocacy combined to make him a speaker of unusual ability and charm. But above all, his dominant traits of character were kindliness and affection for his fellow men. His interests in the fields of education and charity were many. The joys of friendship were his constant and supreme delight.

"The widespread grief occasioned by his death was intensified by the fact that, only sixty-four years of age, his faculties matured by long experience and untiring industry, he appeared to have many years of useful service before him. The Nation has lost an able, high-minded judge, and many of us a gracious friend. Of him it may fittingly be said, as Campbell said of Lord Holt, 'Perhaps the excellence which he attained may be traced to the passion for justice by which he was constantly actuated.'

The Chief Justice said:

"Mr. Attorney General, the Court receives with deep gratification this tribute from the bar to the service of an able and faithful member of this Court, who was taken from us, with tragic suddenness, in the midst of his career.

"The strength of the Court is the resultant of the interaction and cooperation of individual forces, and the successful performance of its function depends upon the discharge of individual responsibility by Justices of equal authority in the decision of all matters that come before the Court. It has recruited its strength both from the bar and from the bench, and the contributions made to the jurisprudence of the Court by those whose judgment has been ripened by the responsibilities of administration in state and federal courts has been a conspicuous feature of its history.

"Mr. Justice Sanford had the advantage not only of careful preparation for the bar under the most exacting and stimulating teachers of the law, and of valuable experience in practice, but of many years of service as a District Judge of the United States. It was the distinguished success with which he met that long-continued test that led to his appointment to this bench. He came here as a graduate of the hard school of judicial experience, and he brought with him an intimate and precise knowledge of the problems of the federal courts. Never sacrificing the dignity, impartiality, and authority of his office as a District Judge to any desire for public favor, his ability and fidelity commanded their appropriate and gratifying reward in the esteem and confidence of the community that he served.

so that the bar and the Legislature of the State of Tennessee gave to the proposal of his appointment to this Court a unanimous indorsement. It was preeminently his judicial quality which won this general esteem. Without eccentricity, affectation, or irritation, but with simplicity, candor, patience, and thoroughness, he had applied himself to every judicial task, whether agreeable or irksome, and the applause which greeted the conduct of his office was a tribute to the standards of the community as well as to his own.

"In the District Court Judge Sanford carried a heavy burden of criminal cases, and, as exemplifying his dominant traits, I may quote what has been said by an eminent member of the bar who had long observed his manner of discharging this duty: 'In the administration of the criminal laws he was judge and not prosecutor. The government was only a litigant in his court suing for justice. It stood on a parity with the humblest citizen it accused. The constitution and laws of his country were to be obeyed, and not evaded, by judge, government, and accused alike.' Especially prominent in every activity was his unfailing courtesy and grace. Never lacking this quality himself, he looked for it in others, and in the District Court under his guidance there was afforded a notable illustration of the commendable restraint and propriety in speech which heighten rather than impair the effectiveness of forensic efforts.

"In addition to sound technical training as a lawyer and broad experience as a judge, Mr. Justice Sanford had resources of culture, developed by travel and liberal studies both here and abroad. He was interested in literature, music, and art, and those who enjoyed companionship with him were not disappointed because of limitations in his horizon. While the learning of the law was his supreme interest, it neither monopolized nor narrowed him. He was happy in his public addresses and brought to many important meetings the charm of eloquence. The members of the bar can not fail to remember with especial pleasure his address in London at the Lord Mayor's dinner at Guild Hall on the occasion of the visit, in 1924, of the representatives of the American Bar Association, and his graceful response to the welcome of the French bench and bar in the Palais de Justice in Paris. The lawyers and judges of France had the unusual and welcome opportunity of listening to an eminent member of the American judiciary paying a beautiful tribute in their own tongue to their achievements and aspirations.

"You have alluded, Mr. Attorney General, to the important opinions delivered for this Court by Mr. Justice Sanford, and, as illustrating the quality of his work, you have referred in particular to the Pocket Veto Case (279 U. S. 655) relating to the authority of the President, and also to the cases in which Mr. Justice Sanford dealt in clear and definite utterance with the power of the State as affecting freedom of speech, upholding the necessary authority to punish abuses of that freedom (Gitlow v. New York, 268 U. S. 652; Whitney v. California, 274 U. S. 357) while also sustaining the constitutional limitations which safeguard the liberty of the citizen (Fiske v. Kansas, 274 U. S. 380). In his work in the District Court Mr. Justice Sanford had given special attention to the difficult problems arising in the administration of the bankruptcy law, and he performed a noteworthy service in this Court in that branch of jurisprudence, writing a number of opinions in leading cases. Meek v. Centre County Banking Company (268 U. S. 426) and Taylor v. Voss (271 U. S. 176) are illustrations. Another outstanding judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Sanford was that in Liberty Warehouse Company v. Grannis (273 U. S. 70) maintaining the essential limitation of the jurisdiction of the Federal courts to 'cases' and 'controversies.' He reaffirmed with careful emphasis the fundamental principle, as he expressed it, 'that the judicial power vested by Article III of the Constitution in this Court and the inferior courts of the United States established by Congress thereunder, extends only to "cases" and "controversies" in which the claims of litigants are brought before them for determination by such regular proceedings as are established for the protection and enforcement of rights, or the prevention, redress, or punishment of wrongs; and that their jurisdiction is limited to cases and controversies presented in such form, with adverse litigants, that the judicial power is capable of acting upon them, and pronouncing and carrying into effect a judgment between the parties, and does not extend to the determination of abstract questions or issues framed for the purpose

"In estimating the value of judicial work, it is well not to lay too much stress upon opinions which seem to have a particular importance because of the public attention they receive or the spectacular circumstances of the controversies to which they are addressed. Juristic achievements are not measured by the distinction of litigants, or the amount in controversy, or the dramatic setting which gives temporary notoriety. The most worthy performance of judicial duty in the careful analysis of facts, in exact reasoning, and in the observance of a correct perspective in bringing the results of earlier controversies to their appropriate present service, may be found in cases which attract at the time little attention on the part of the general public, but achieve importance in the annals of jurisprudence. The final reputation of a judge owes far less to contemporary estimate than to the inevitable later appraisal when his efforts find their appropriate historical setting.

"Mr. Justice Sanford was keenly aware of this, and, with philosophic bent and conscientious application, he was faithful to the judicial tradition, devoting the same care to every case which came before the Court, without regard to its rating in public opinion. He was ever intent upon the intrinsic quality of his work rather than upon adventitious circumstance.

"Although cut off in mid-career, as judicial careers are reckoned, we gratefully recognize the long service that he rendered in a life which enjoyed a succession of deserved honors and was crowned by the fulfillment of a worthy ambition. He met every responsibility with integrity of motive and singleness of purpose, and he discharged every trust with complete fidelity. His life is epitomized in his own words: 'Youth and age have come; youth rejoicing in the splendor of life's morning; and age, steadfast, in the majesty of its noonday, serene in the tender glow of its evening sky.' In the midst of that serenity, the final summons came, and he was taken from us. Mourning our loss, but enriched by the memory of his friendship and cooperation, we renew our labors."

Georgia Public Service Commission, James A. Perry, Albert J. Woodruff, et al., etc., Appellants, vs. The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission, et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

555

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

State of Alabama and Alabama Public Service Commission, Appellants, vs. United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama.

513

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Alabama, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

21 vs.

The Equitable Trust Company of New York, Murray, Aldrich & Roberts, Edward J. Patterson, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, modified, and as so modified, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Mr. Justice Stone did not participate in the consideration or decision of this case.

Marshall L. Mott,

Petitioner,

78 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Mr. Justice Stone did not participate in the consideration or decision of this case.

Hilary Halbert, Jr., Dorothy Halbert
Rubble, Mildred Halbert, a Minor,
etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
141 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Rich Halbert, a Minor, by Fred P.
Halbert, Guardian Ad Litem,
Petitioner,
142 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Vernon Sidney Halbert, a Minor, by Benjamin F. Halbert, Guardian Ad Litem, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

143

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Sidney E. Halbert, a Minor, by Sidney Seth Halbert, Guardian Ad Litem, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

144

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Rose Peers Pickernoll, Mabel Peers White, and Amelia Peers Alden, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

145 On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Lulu M. Elliott, Sophie M. Elliott, Carolyn M. Elliott, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

146 On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Mary Barichio Petit and Norris Petit,
Ellis A. Petit, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

147 On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Dewey Barichio and Leda E. Barichio,
Romie D. Barichio, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

148 On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Edna May Elliott, Ruth G. Elliott,
William H. Elliott, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 149

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Chas. G. Elliott, Jr., Anna Marie Elliott, Henry Elliott, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 150

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Agnes Rubens, Louis Henry Peterson,
Mary Henry Hagen, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 151

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Virginia Walkowsky, Alvin Walkowsky,
Catherine Walkowsky, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 152

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Lizzie Rolfson, Alvin Smith,
Eugene Smith, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

153 On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Mary Francis Provoe, Laura M. Brown,
Frank M. Provoe, et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

154 On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decree of the District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

J. M. Near,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

91 vs. State of Minnesota.

The State of Minnesota ex rel. Floyd B. Olson, County Attorney of Hennepin County, Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Butler in which Mr. Justice Van Devanter, Mr. Justice McReynolds, and Mr. Justice Sutherland concur.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

—

In re Disbarment of William E. Baff. ORDER.

It having been brought to the attention of the Court that the name of William E. Baff has been stricken from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice in the District Court of the United States for the Central Division of the Southern District of California; and a notice having issued to the said William E. Baff, March 23, 1931, to show cause why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court and his name stricken from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice here; and the said Baff having filed his response to such notice;

And it having also been brought to the attention of the Court that the said Baff was disbarred from the practice of the law in the United States Patent Office on March 18, 1921, upon charges of misconduct; and that his application to be re-registered as a member of the Patent Office Bar was denied upon March 28, 1929 by the Commissioner of Patents; and that the action of the Commissioner of Patents in refusing recognition to the said Baff as a patent attorney was sustained by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia on February 19, 1931;

Now, therefore, It is ordered that the order of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California striking the name of the said Baff from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice before that Court; the order of the Commissioner of Patents disbarring the said Baff from practice as an Attorney in the United States Patent Office, together with his said order refusing Baff re-registration and the order of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia approving such refusal; the notice to show cause issued by this Court; and the response of the said Baff, with the exhibits thereto, be, and the same are hereby, referred to Mr. Guerney E. Newlin, of Los Angeles, State of California, to Mr. Warren Olney, Jr., of San Francisco, State of California, and to Mr. Melville Church, of Washington, District of Columbia, as a committee of the bar of this Court, to make such inquiry into the matter as may be necessary or appropriate, and thereupon to make a report and recommendation respecting the final action to be taken herein by this Court conformably to Rule 2, par. 5, of the Rules of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

ORDER.

1. It is ordered by this Court that section 6 of Rule 32 of this Court be amended by striking therefrom the words "For docketing a case and filing and indorsing the transcript of the record, five dollars," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "For docketing a case and filing and indorsing the transcript of the record, ten dollars."

2. Also, by striking therefrom the words "For preparing the record or a transcript thereof for the printer, in all cases, including records presented with petitions for certiorari, indexing the same, supervising the printing, and distributing the printed copies to the justices, the reporter, the law library, and the parties or their counsel, four cents per folio of each one hundred words," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "For preparing the record or a transcript thereof for the printer, in all cases, including records presented with petitions for certiorari, indexing the same, supervising the printing, and distributing the printed copies to the justices, the reporter, the law library, and the parties or their counsel, eight cents per folio of each one hundred words," but leaving therein unchanged the words "but where the necessary printed copies of the record as printed for the use of the court below are furnished, charges under this item will be limited to any additions printed here under the clerk's supervision."

3. Also, by striking therefrom the words "For filing briefs, three dollars for each party appearing," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "For filing briefs, five dollars for each party appearing."

This order shall apply to causes filed here on or after July 1, 1931, but not to causes filed prior to that date.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

ORDER.

It is ordered that Rule XLVI of the General Orders in Bankruptcy, promulgated January 13, 1930,(280 U. S. 617), be amended by striking out from the last sentence the words "not less than two per cent. per annum" and by inserting the word "such" before the words "local rule" at the end of the Rule, and thus amended the Rule will read as follows:

"Whenever a custodian, receiver or trustee is a banking institution designated and qualified pursuant to section 61 of the Act to act as depositary for money, said banking institution may, if authorized by rule of the local Bankruptcy Court approved by a majority of the Circuit Judges of the Circuit, keep on deposit with itself money received by it as custodian, receiver or trustee, if said banking institution under the local laws of the state of its domicile is permitted to keep on deposit with itself money collected and received by it acting as receiver or trustee under the appointment of any court. Such local rule shall contain such provisions for the supervision and control of such deposits as the court may deem adequate, and on all sums of money not less than $100 so kept on deposit interest shall be allowed by such banking institution at such rate as may from time to time be directed by such local rule."

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

ORDER.

It is ordered that the official bond for $20,000, required of the Clerk and duly executed by him and the Aetna Casualty and Surety Company, on June 6, 1931, and approved by the Chief Justice, shall be recorded and deposited with the Attorney General for safe keeping.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1930.

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS,

That we, Charles Elmore Cropley, as principal, and The Aetna Casualty and Surety Company, Hartford, Connecticut, as surety, are held and firmly bound unto the United States of America in the penal sum of Twenty Thousand ($20,000) Dollars lawful money of the United States, to be paid to the said United States of America or their certain attorney, to which payment, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals and dated this 6th day of June, A. D. 1931.

Whereas, the above bounden Charles Elmore Cropley hath been appointed Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Now Therefore, the conditions of the above obligation is such that if he, the said Charles Elmore Cropley, shall faithfully discharge the duties of his said office, and seasonably record the decrees, judgments and determinations of the said Supreme Court of the United States, then this obligation to be void, otherwise, to remain in full force and virtue in law.

Signed, sealed and delivered
in the presence of:

Harold B. Willey.

Howard E. Black.

CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY

THE AETNA CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY

By:- P. D. Compton (Seal)
Attorney-in-fact.

Approved June 1st, 1931, by order of the Court.

CHARLES E. HUGHES

Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

ORDER.

It is ordered that the bond for $100,000 additional to his official bond required of the Clerk by order of the Court dated June 6, 1927, and duly executed by him and the Aetna Casualty and Surety Company on June 6, 1931, and approved by the Chief Justice, shall be deposited with the Attorney General for safe keeping.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

October Term, 1930

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS,

That we, Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, as principal, and The Aetna Casualty and Surety Company, Hartford, Connecticut, as surety, are held and firmly bound unto the United States of America, for the benefit of the litigants in the Supreme Court of the United States and of all others, as their interests may appear, in the penal sum of One Hundred Thousand ($100,000.) Dollars lawful money of the United States, to be paid to the said United States for the benefit of the said litigants and of all others, as their interests may appear, for which payments, well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals, and dated this 6th day of June 1931.

Now Therefore, the condition of this bond is such that if the said Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk as aforesaid, shall well and truly perform the services for which moneys by law or under the rules of the Court are advanced or paid to him, and shall truly and faithfully account for such moneys thus advanced or paid, and for any excess thereof after the services are rendered, and also for all other moneys received by him as such Clerk, in accordance with law or the orders of this Court, then this obligation to be void; otherwise to remain in full force and virtue in law.

CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY

Witnesses:
Harold B. Willey.
Howard E. Black.

THE AETNA CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY

By: F. D. Compton (Seal)
Attorney-in-Fact.

Approved June 1st, 1931, by order of the Court.

CHARLES E. HUGHES

ORDER.

It appearing to the Court that the Clerk, by direction of the Court or pursuant to an established practice, is supplying certain law schools, libraries, bar associations and others with copies of the printed papers in cases disposed of by this Court from the discarded papers of the members of this Court or from the surplus supply of such papers in his office,

And it appearing that the Clerk is now supplying these papers to maintain sets thereof in the following institutions:

Cornell University, Ithaca, New York,

Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Law Association of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

San Francisco Law Library, San Francisco, California.

Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota.

University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky.

Columbia University, New York City.

Lawyers Co-Operative Publishing Company, Rochester, New York.

West Publishing Company, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Association of the Bar, New York City.

Alleghany County Law Library, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Chicago Bar Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Connecticut State Library, Hartford, Connecticut.

Social Law Library, Boston, Massachusetts.

Cleveland Law Library, Cleveland, Ohio.

Michigan State Library, Lansing, Michigan.

State Library, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Indiana Supreme Court Library, Indianapolis, Indiana.

University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

It is ordered by this Court that the Clerk is directed to continue in effect this service to the law schools, libraries, bar associations and others specified herein, subject to the further order of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

* Amended March 27, 1937 - see 1936 Minutes p. 653.
* Amended May 27, 1940 see 1939 Minutes p 891-2

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Appellant,
193 vs.
Hal Norwood, Attorney General of the State of Arkansas, et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to modify the mandate in this cause, It is ordered that the judgment herein be modified so that the judgment clause will appear in the mandate as follows:

On consideration whereof, It is ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs without prejudice to any application to the District Court to amend the pleadings or otherwise.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Iowa-Des Moines National Bank, Petitioner,
711 vs.
J. M. Stewart, Chairman, etc.

The expiration of the term of office of C. F. Keeling as a member of the Board of Supervisors of Polk County, Iowa, and the election of Ben B. Dewey as a member thereto, and the selection of E. R. Bennett as Chairman of said Board of Supervisors in place of J. M. Stewart, having been suggested;

It is, on motion of counsel for the petitioner in this cause, ordered by the Court that Ben B. Dewey, successor in office of C. F. Keeling, and E. R. Bennett, present Chairman of said Board, be substituted as parties respondents in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Central State Bank, Petitioner,
712 vs.
J. M. Stewart, Chairman, etc.

The expiration of the term of office of C. F. Keeling as a member of the Board of Supervisors of Polk County, Iowa, and the election of Ben B. Dewey as a member thereto, and the selection of E. R. Bennett as Chairman of said Board of Supervisors in place of J. M. Stewart, having been suggested;

It is on motion of counsel for the petitioner in this cause ordered by the Court that Ben B. Dewey, successor in office of C. F. Keeling, and E. R. Bennett, present Chairman of said Board, be substituted as parties respondents in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States, Petitioner,
759 vs.
Kirby Lumber Company.

It is ordered that further consideration of the motion by respondent to remand this case to the Court of Claims for further findings be postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Colorado, Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
The State of Kansas, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to introduce the evidence of A. J. Abbott and James Craig taken in a prior case, It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to the presentation to this Court upon the hearing of the transcript containing the depositions described in the motion papers. The question of admissibility is postponed to the hearing.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, et al., Appellants,
793 vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Appellant,
815 vs.
Harry Murdock.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State Tax Commission of Mississippi, et al., Appellants,
833 vs.
Interstate Natural Gas Company, Inc.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, et al.

943

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 5 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. L. Moye, Appellant, vs. State of North Carolina and Town of Ahoskie.

807

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

School District No. 7, Muskogee County, Oklahoma, et al., et c. Appellants, vs. Clarence Munnicutt, County Superintendent of Public Schools of Muskogee County, Oklahoma.

813

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James G. Clyne,

Appellant,

839 vs.

The State of Ohio.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Western and Atlantic Railroad,

Appellant,

869 vs.

Mrs. Helen N. Gray.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

915 vs.

Frank B. Campbell.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company,
Petitioner,
917 vs.
Eugene Bolle.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, 2nd District, is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gong Bell Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
982 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Further consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari in this case is withheld to await the decision of this Court in No. 709, Handy & Harman v. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. D. Cummins and Company,
Petitioner,
754 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. D. Cummins and Company,
Petitioner,
754 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this case to the Court of Claims for further findings,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pacific Northwest Canning Company, Petitioner, vs. Skookum Packer's Association. 918

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pacific Northwest Canning Company, Petitioner, vs. Skookum Packer's Association. 919

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. W. Davis and George Ferguson, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 960

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joe Davis,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

998

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Rudolph Wurlitzer Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

845

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Birkel Music Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

846

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Hughes.

Parlex Holding Corporation, Petitioner, vs. The City of New York. 863

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Meyersdale Fuel Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 864

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Columbia Steel & Shafting Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States. 867

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Benjamin Clayton,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

871 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

P. L. Mann,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

875 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harvey S. Stewart, Present Sheriff and
Tax Collector of Pearl River County,
Mississippi, et al.,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

902 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Edward Hines Yellow Pine Trustees, of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward E. Marshall,

Petitioner,

904 vs.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Crimora Manganese Corporation and United Chemical and Industrial Companies,

Petitioners,

905 vs.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

913 vs.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, a Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, a Corporation, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

914

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles Hazlitt Cahan, Jr., Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

916

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Taylor Oil & Gas Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

920

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gust Gerling,

Petitioner,

923 vs.

Fred J. Dankers, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of William H. Miller, Deceased, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gust Gerling,

Petitioner,

924 vs.

Fred J. Dankers, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of William H. Miller, Deceased, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wabash Railway Company,

Petitioner,

925 vs.

Harvey E. Lindley.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Art Metal Construction Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

932

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry C. Zeller and Edward G. Zeller, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

933

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert Gordon Duncan, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

937

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gust Gerling,

Petitioner,

923 vs.

Fred J. Dankers, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of William H. Miller, Deceased, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gust Gerling,

Petitioner,

924 vs.

Fred J. Dankers, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of William H. Miller, Deceased, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wabash Railway Company,

Petitioner,

925 vs.

Harvey E. Lindley.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Art Metal Construction Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

932

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry C. Zeller and Edward C. Zeller, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

933

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert Gordon Duncan, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

937

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry A. Schweinhaut, Trustee in
Bankruptcy of Wardman Park Taxicab
Company, Inc., Petitioner,
939 vs.
Delia Flaherty.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ballard Brothers Fish Company, Inc.,
Rela K. Ferris, David H. Smith, et al.,
Petitioners,
940 vs.
Percy S. Stephenson, Trustee in
Bankruptcy of Norfolk Residence
Corporation, Bankrupt, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James W. Merkle,
Petitioner,
941 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Helen Lay, Lumbermen's Reciprocal Association, et al., etc., Petitioners, vs. E. Forrest Mitchell, as Insurance Commissioner of the State of California.

942 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Niagara Falls Gas and Electric Light Company, Petitioner, vs. William A. Prendergast, et al., etc., et al.

946 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

U. S. Light & Heat Corporation and Adolph M. Hamann, Petitioners, vs. William A. Prendergast, et al., etc., et al.

947 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

City of Niagara Falls, New York,

Petitioner,

948 vs.

U. S. Light & Heat Corporation, et al., etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank Shore,

Petitioner,

951 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry H. Cross Company,

Petitioner,

957 vs.

Wilson Rice, Trustee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Brown's "Shamrock" Linens, Ltd.,
Petitioner,
969 vs.
Frank C. Bowers, as Executor of the Estate of Frank K. Bowers, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louis Bonamico, alias Louis Toriana,
Petitioner,
977 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

General Talking Pictures Corporation and DeForest Phonofilms, Inc.,
Petitioners,
986 vs.
The Stanley Company of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

F. W. Darling,
Petitioner,
995 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Roy Myers,
Petitioner,
997 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Miller, Claimant of the
French Oil Screw Metmuzel,
Petitioner,
1000 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Albert B. Fall, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

1007 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. E. Lane, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

1011 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner, On consideration of the motion for leave to file motion for modification of the judgment in this cause, to extend the term for this purpose, and for stay of the mandate,

484 vs.

Raladam Company.

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, said motion to modify the judgment to be filed within thirty days and mandate stayed pending disposition of the motion by this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State Board of Tax Commissioners of the State of Indiana, et al.,

Appellants,

183 vs.

Lafayette A. Jackson.

On consideration of the motions of counsel for the appellee in this cause to substitute Chester H. Jackson, administrator of the estate of Lafayette A. Jackson, deceased, in place of the said Lafayette A. Jackson, and for extension of time within which to file a petition for rehearing, and for stay of the mandate;

It is ordered that Chester H. Jackson, as administrator, be substituted in place of Lafayette A. Jackson, deceased, and made the party appellee in this cause.

It is further ordered that the time within which to file a petition for rehearing be extended thirty days, and that the mandate in this cause be stayed pending the disposition of the petition for rehearing.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

ORDER.

All cases submitted, and all business before the Court, at this term, having been disposed of,

It is ordered by this Court that all cases on the docket be, and they are hereby, continued to the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned to the time and place appointed

VOLU

19

UME

31

ccess

At the Capitol
District of Columbia, be
United States, on the fi
month) in the year of ou
of the Independence of t
Supreme Court of the Uni

PRESENT:

The Honorable

Frank K.
Charles E

Proclamation b

On motion first
Casto, It is ordered tha
State of Oregon, be admi
Court, and he was sworn

On motion first
Quirk, It is ordered tha
Missouri, be admitted to
and he was sworn accordi

On motion first
Fenwick, It is ordered t
Florida, be admitted to
and he was sworn accordi

of the United States, in the City of Washington, and
ing the present Seat of the National Government of the
rst Monday of October (being the 5th day of the same
r Lord one thousand, nine hundred and thirty-one and
he United States the one hundred and fifty-sixth, The
ted States met agreeably to law.

Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts.

Green, Esquire, Marshal.
lmore Cropley, Clerk.

sing made the Court is opened.

t made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George D.
t Dayton E. Van Vactor, Esquire, of Klamath Falls,
tted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this
accordingly.

t made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E.
t Charles L. Carr, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of
practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court,
ngly.

t made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles R.
nat Martin Sack, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of
practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court,
ngly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank L. Hatch, It is ordered that James B. Searcy, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dozier A. DeVane, It is ordered that D. Miel Ferguson, Esquire, of Ocala, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Enoch Aquila Chase, It is ordered that Alonzo H. Garcelon, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Price, It is ordered that David W. Jacobs, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that Alma M. Myers, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Price, It is ordered that Norman A. Bailie, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Houston Merrill, It is ordered that Eugene Harpole, Esquire, of Superior, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert L. Reed, It is ordered that Lon E. Blankenbecker, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy St. Lewis, It is ordered that John F. Sharp, Jr., Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that J. Andrew West, Esquire, of Prescott, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert L. Reed, It is ordered that Elbert Hooper, Esquire, of Ft. Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elisha Hanson, It is ordered that J. Mark Trice, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Painters District Council No. 14 of Chicago, etc., Appellants,
41 vs.
The United States of America.

The suggestion of a diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the appell

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, et al., Appellants, 287 vs. The United States of America, et al.

The joint motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in that behalf.

T. Binford, et al., Appellants, 391 vs. J. H. McLeaish & Company, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. L. Reed for the appellants.

Maas & Waldstein Company, Petitioner, 263, October Term, 1930. vs. The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Mr. Hugh Satterlee and Mr. Rollin Browne, as amici curiae, in this cause.

Arizona Grocery Company, Petitioner, 98 vs. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. H. L. Underwood, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Interstate Commerce Commission as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Arizona Grocery Company, Petitioner, 98 vs. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. John E. Benton, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Arizona Corporation Commission, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Petitioner, 60 vs. Eugene Bolle.

The suggestion of a diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John P. Bramhall for the respondent.

Manuel V. Domenech, Treasurer of Porto Rico,
Petitioner,
331 vs.
Porto Rican Leaf Tobacco Company.

On consideration of the motion on behalf of counsel for the respondent for leave to file brief of respondent out of time,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted with leave to petitioner to file a reply brief within three days.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Winchester Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
218 vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. S. Bright for the petitioner, in support thereof, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. James A. Cosgrove for the respondent in opposition thereto.

The Chemical Foundation, Inc.,
Petitioner,
285 vs.
General Electric Company, et al.

The motion for leave to file brief of Radiological Society of North America and Radiological Research Institute, Inc., as amici curiae, was submitted by Mr. Seward Davis in that behalf, and the motion was denied.

Roy Marx and Roy Marx Barber Shops, Inc.,

Appellants,

434 vs.

Charles R. Maybury, as Director of Licenses for the State of Washington, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington.

Mr. Blain Mallan, in behalf of counsel for the appellees, having filed in open Court the following certificate, to-wit:

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) SS.

I, Ed M. Lakin, Clerk of the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, hereby certify that the above entitled action was heard on appellants' petition for a temporary injunction in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington on the 22nd day of July, 1929, at which time the parties stipulated that all matters relating to the issuance of a permanent injunction might be adjudicated at said hearing; that the court filed its written decision on the 4th day of December, 1929, (36 Fed. 2nd ed. 397) denying the appellants the relief sought except in one particular; that a decree based on this decision was signed and filed on the 5th day of May, 1930; that notice of appeal, order fixing cost bond, supersedeas order, assignments of error and order allowing appeal signed by Honorable Jeremiah Neterer, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington on July 3, 1930, were filed on July 3, 1930; that citation on appeal was signed by the Honorable Jeremiah Neterer, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington on July 3, 1930, and filed on that date.

I further certify that no order enlarging the time for docketing said cause has been filed or is of record in my office.

Ed. M. Lakin
Clerk of the District Court of the United States, for the Western District of Washington.

(SEAL)

By (signed) S. M. H. Cook, Deputy.

Dated this 18th day of July, 1931."

and having moved the Court to docket and dismiss this cause pursuant to the 11th Rule.

And it appearing to the Court that the appellants have failed to have their cause filed and docketed in conformity with the rules of this Court,

It is ordered, adjudged and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, docketed and dismissed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the Western District of Washington to be proceeded in according to law and justice.

PerMr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Maas & Waldstein Company,
Petitioner,
263, October Term, 1930. vs.
The United States.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Mr. Ward Loveless, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

The United States ofAmerica,
Complainant,
16, Original. vs.
The State of Oregon.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file an amended answer and counterclaim of the defendant in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Washington,
Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The State of Oregon.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the answer of the defendant in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway Company, Appellant,
300 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky;
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, Appellant,
301 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Calhoun for the appellants.

John M. Brandt, Company, Petitioner,
454, O.T. 1930. vs.
The United States.

The motion for leave to file petition for rehearing herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David J. Shorb for the petitioner.

Nicola Ranieri, Petitioner,
361 vs.
S. D. Smith, District Director in charge of Immigration, etc.

The motion to consider the petition for writ of certiorari on unprinted papers was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John H. Chumbley for the petitioner.

L. A. Nixon, Petitioner,
265 vs.
James Condon and C. H. Kolle.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. J. Alston Atkins, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of C. N. Love, Julius White, and others as amici curiae, in this cause.

No. —.
In the matter of the Disbarment of William E. Baff.

The report of the Committee of the Bar was presented to the Court.

Ex parte: James Edward Murphy,
——, Original. Petitioner,

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Edward Murphy pro se.

Ex parte: Richard Husty,
—, Original. Petitioner,

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Percy F. Parrott for the petitioner.

The State of Wisconsin, et al.,
Complainants,
5, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois, et al.;
The State of Michigan, et al.,
Complainants,
8, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois, et al.;
The State of New York, et al.,
Complainants,
9, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois, et al.

The semi-annual report of the defendant as to progress made, dated July 1, 1931 was presented to the Court.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
11, Original. vs.
State of Indiana, et al.

Report No. 3 of the defendant, State of Indiana, dated August 29, 1931, was presented to the Court.

T. E. Clemmons, Executor of the
Estate of E. B. Slaton, Appellant,
353 vs.
A. L. Hall, Administrator of the
Estate of Carl Hall.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the appellant has filed a motion to dismiss the appeal in this cause;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Rocky Brook Mills Company,
Petitioner,
47 vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Phillip Hill for the petitioner in support thereof and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. R. C. Williamson for the respondent in opposition thereto.

S. P. Knut, Individually, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
351 vs.
Patrick Henry, Executor, etc.;
S. P. Knut, Individually, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
352 vs.
Elizabeth H. Forsyth, et al.

The motions to dismiss these cases were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gerard Brandon for the respondents.

Joseph Vallanvanti,
Petitioner,
123 vs.
Armour & Company.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Asa P. French for the petitioner.

Leonard Fernandez,
Petitioner,
126 vs.
Harry M. Kaiser, as Warden of Clinton Prison, Dannemora, N. Y.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leonard Fernandez pro se.

Max Leibowitz, et al.,
Petitioners,
144 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Max Leibowitz pro se.

Cammillus Soleau, et al., Petitioners, 166 vs. Josephine Soleau, et al.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard Lewis for the petitioners.
Ida E. Tutson, Petitioner, 220 vs. Joseph F. Holland, et al.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elwo C. Hubert for the petitioner.
Glen E. Minnick, Administrator, etc., Petitioner, 410 vs. Southern Railway Company.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul Dulaney for the petitioner.
Rocky Brook Mills Company, Petitioner, 47 vs. The United States.	The petition for writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Phillip Hill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. R. C. Williamson for the respondent.
Earl L. Fisher, et al., Petitioners, 61 vs. Scott Redfield and Berwick B. Wood, copartners, etc., et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. H Van Winkle and Mr. Willis S. Moore for the petitioners, and by Mr. Erskine Wood for the respondents.

American Hide and Leather Company,
Petitioner,
62 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Hayes and Mr. George E. Hamilton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. George H. Foster for the respondent.

Willie Tiger and Alexander George,
Petitioners,
65 vs.
Emory Timmons, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Creekmore Wallace for the petitioners, and by Mr. Thomas J. Flannelly for the respondents.

M. Hohenberg, et al., co-partners, etc.,
Petitioners,
70 vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chas. E. Cotterill for the petitioners, and by Mr. Robert E. Steiner for the respondent.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
73 vs.
Duris Berry.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic B. Scott for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph Coult for the respondent.

Walter Beck,
Petitioner,
74 vs.
Missouri Valley Drainage District of Holt County, Missouri, et al., etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Cyrus Crane for the petitioner.

Daniel H. Coakley,
Petitioner,
75 vs.
Equitable Bank & Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas H. Mahony for the petitioner.

Akties, Dampskibsselskabet Donneborg, as Owner of the Steamship Sonderborg, et al., etc., Petitioners,
76 vs.
C. Mikkelsen, H. Olsson, et al.;
C. Mikkelsen, et al., Petitioners,
190 vs.
Akties, Dampskibsselskabet Donneborg, etc., et al.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leon T. Seawell for the petitioners, in No. 76; by Mr. Jacob L. Morewitz for the petitioners in No. 190 and respondents in No. 76.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
78 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. L. Bell, Mr. William F. Peter, and Mr. Thos. P. Littlepage for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch Mr. Sewell Key, Mr. John Henry McEvers, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Chicago & Eastern Illinois R. R. Co., Petitioner,
79 vs.
Industrial Commission of Illinois and Joe Thomas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Cook County, State of Illinois, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward W. Rawlins and Mr. Thos. P. Littlepage for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel E. Hirsch for the respondents.

Leon E. Harker, Petitioner,
81 vs.
Ralston Purina Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry H. Hornbrook for the petitioner, and by Mr. P. Taylor Bryan, Mr. George H. Williams, and Mr. Thos. S. McPheeters for the respondent.

I. Tanenbaum Son & Company, Petitioner,
82 vs.
Drumbor-Bingell Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Carr for the petitioner.

Howard Thomas, Administrator of the Estate of Harold James Pringle, deceased, Petitioner,
83 vs.
Morton Salt Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leo J. Carrigan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Burt D. Cady and Mr. Samuel D. Pepper for the respondent.

The United States, Petitioner, 85 vs. Olympia Shipping Corporation.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Walter F. Welch for the respondent.
Matson Navigation Company, Petitioner, 137 vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William C. Feely, Mr. Herman Phleger, and Mr. Maurice E. Harrison for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.
Elgin, Joliet, and Eastern Railway Company, Petitioner, 86 vs, Richard R. Churchill, Administrator, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, First District, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Kemper K. Knapp and Mr. William Beye for the petitioner, and by Mr. Herbert H. Patterson for the respondent.
Elgin, Joliet, and Eastern Railway Company, Petitioner, 87 vs. Richard R. Churchill, Administrator, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Kemper K. Knapp and Mr. William Beye for the petitioner, and by Mr. Herbert H. Patterson for the respondent.

Olympic Salt Water Company, Petitioner,
90 vs.
The Shipowners and Merchants Tugboat Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert W. Clark for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas A. Thacher for the respondent.

Lehigh Valley Transit Company, Petitioner,
92 vs.
Roger H. Zanes.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen Hunter White and Mr. Frederic L. Ballard for the petitioner, and by Mr. Daniel Burke for the respondent.

M. C. Garber, Petitioner,
93 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
L. G. Moore, Petitioner,
94 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
James Tait, Petitioner,
95 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
W. F. Kistler Estate, et al., Petitioner,
96 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hubert L. Bolem, Mr. S. W. Hayes, and Mr. D. A. Richardson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John Henry McEvers, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Arizona Grocery Company,
Petitioner,
98 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel White for the petitioner, and by Mr. L. H. Chalmers, Mr. Thos. C. Nairn, Mr. E. W. Camp, Mr. James K. Lyons, and Mr. R. S. Outlaw for the respondents.

William Driscoll and Thomas Driscoll,
Petitioners,
99 vs.
The State of Colorado, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin H. Park for the petitioners, and by Mr. Paul P. Prosser, Mr. Edward M. Freeman, and Mr. C. L. Ireland for the respondents.

Hamilton Rubber Manufacturing Company, et al., Petitioners,
100 vs.
Maco Stewart, Sr., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Davis for the petitioner and by Mr. Maco Stewart, Jr. for the respondents.

William F. Kelly,
Petitioner,
101 vs.
The Queensboro National Bank of the City of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William F. Kelly, pro se, and by Mr. Morris Kamber for the respondent.

Samson Tire & Rubber Company,
Petitioner,
102 vs.
R. H. Eggleston, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg for the petitioner, and by Mr. William S. Pritchard for the respondent.

Aetna Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
103 vs.
Lucy C. Wharton.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. Hasker Ehrman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. H. Rector and Mr. Elbert E. Godwin for the respondent.

H. P. Coffee Company,
Petitioner,
104 vs.
Reid, Murdock & Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roy M. Eilers for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred Gerlach and Mr. Douglas W. Robert for the respondent.

Charles Lantz,
Petitioner,
106 vs.
Thornhill Francis Broome.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward Fitzpatrick, Mr. Robert N. Miller, and Mr. Donald V. Hunter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred E. Pettit, Jr., and Mr. Charles F. Blackstock for the respondent.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
107 vs.
Jules Emmannel Denis Cornec, Master, etc., et al.,

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. P. Whip and Mr. Duncan K. Brent for the petitioner and by Mr. John C. Prizer, Mr. George Forbes, Mr. John Henry Skeen, and Mr. Emory H. Niles for the respondent.

Southern Railway - Carolina Division,
Petitioner,
108 vs.
Minnie L. Neal, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. John B. Hyde, Mr. Lionel K. Legge, Mr. Nath B. Barnwell, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the petitioner, and by Mr. John P. Grace for the respondent.

Benigno Velazquez,
Petitioner,
109 vs.
R. W. Rickson, Master, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob L. Morewitz for the petitioner.

S. J. Schneider, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
110 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elwood Hamilton and Mr. J. C. W. Beckham, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Morton K. Rothschild, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Skaggs Safeway Stores, Inc., Petitioner,
111 vs.
Fred Dunkle.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leonard J. Flansburg for the petitioner.

Lamont, Corliss & Co., Ponds Extract Co., Petitioners,
113 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. A. Levett for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Charles D. Lawrence, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Celanese Corporation of America, Petitioner,
121 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Addison S. Pratt for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Charles D. Lawrence, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

F. B. Vandegrift & Company, et al., Petitioners,
135 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Stewart Tompkins for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Charles D. Lawrence, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

F. M. Jabara & Bros.,
Petitioner,
254 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel Isenschmid and Mr. Thomas M. Lane for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Charles D. Lawrence, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

The American Foundation, Inc.,
Petitioner,
255 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry P. Adair and Mr. John C. Cooper, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Charles D. Lawrence, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Wilbur-Ellis Co., et al.,
Petitioners,
286 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin T. Baldwin for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Charles D. Lawrence, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Citizens Bank of Warrenton,
Petitioner,
114 vs.
Warner Moore.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James H. Bridgers for the petitioner.

Edgar Percy Lewis, et al.,
Petitioner,
115 vs.
Marshall S. Reynolds, Individually, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. N. E. Corthell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Miss Helen R. Carloss, Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

James Solomont, Trustee,
Petitioner,
116
O'Neill-Orr Construction Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob J. Kaplan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Scott M. Loftin, Mr. Jno. P. Stokes, and Mr. James E. Calkins for the respondent.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
117 vs.
L. T. McCready and Maryland Casualty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. I. Gilbert, Mr. Frank C. Cleary, and Mr. Guy V. Shoup for the petitioner, and by Mr. L. E. Dadmun and Mr. Walter L. Clark for the respondent.

American Automobile Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
119 vs.
Castle, Roper-Mathews, and Charles H. Roper.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. H. Allen for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. Petrus Peterson for the respondents.

Nelson P. Gay, Executor of David S. Gay, deceased, Petitioner,
124 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Kerr and Mr. A. K. Shipe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. Marshall Bullitt for the respondent.

Harold C. Hill, Tax Assessor, etc., Petitioner,
125 vs.
Helen Strong Carter.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mason F. Prosser, Mr. Robbins B. Anderson, and Mr. Benjamin L. Marx for the respondent.

Grand Trunk Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
127 vs.
Marion Heatlie, Special Administratrix, etc.;
Grand Trunk Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
128 vs.
Ida May Drew, Special Administratrix, etc.;
Grand Trunk Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
129 vs.
James White.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic T. Harward and Mr. H. V. Spike for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas J. Bresnahan and Mr. Elmer H. Groefsema for the respondents.

Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners,
130 vs.
Ben Terte, Judge of the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Hackney and Mr. Cyrus Crane for the petitioners, and by Mr. Clay C.

Charles Beadon, et al., Petitioners,
131 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Abraham Rosenthal for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

States Steamship Company, Petitioner,
132 vs.
Jac Wychgel.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Erskine Wood for the petitioner, and by Mr. John C. Veatch for the respondent.

Pueblo de San Juan, Petitioner,
133 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Fahy, Mr. Richard H. Hanna, and Mr. Nathan R. Margold for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. George A. H. Fraser, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

The Great Lakes Towing Company, Petitioner,
134 vs.
The Kinsman Transit Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Cottrell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick L. Leckie for the respondent.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
138 vs.
Silica Products Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur C. Brown for the petitioners, and by Mr. I. N. Watson, Mr. Henry H. Ess, and Mr. Thomas E. Scofield for the respondent.

Otto W. Klose, Petitioner,
139 vs.
The United States of America;
Arthur Lorenz, Petitioner,
140 vs.
The United States of America.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto W. Klose, and Mr. Arthur Lorenz pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Grays Harbor Motorship Corp., Petitioner,
141 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cletus Keating for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Whitney North Seymour Mr. Wm. H. Scott, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Excelsior Brewing, Inc., and Pulaski Holding Company, Petitioners,
143 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John R. K. Scott and Mr. William T. Connor for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Ernest E. Cook, et al.,
Petitioners,
145 vs.
The Illinois Bankers Life Association, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Bingham for the petitioners, and by Mr. Ralph F. Potter for the respondents.

Victor Blackwood,
Petitioner,
147 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Lewis and Mr. Matthew L. McGrath for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. A. W. Henderson for the respondent.

John Garcia,
Petitioner,
148 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Waguespack for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

The Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York,
Petitioner,
149 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. M. Williams and Mr. Frederick L. Allen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. L. A. Smith, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Houston Oil & Transport Company,
Petitioner,
150 vs.
Aetna Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carl C. Stearns for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Newton Rayzor and Mr. Mart H. Royston for the respondent.

Earl D. Bess,
Petitioner,
151 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Raymond Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, Mr. A. E. Gottschall, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Oglesby Coal Company,
Petitioner,
152 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Michael F. Callagher and Mr. Samuel M. Rinaker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Miss Helen Carloss for the respondent.

James P. Jones,
Petitioner,
153 vs.
Commonwealth of Virginia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Minitree J. Fulton for the petition

Hans Gredig, et al., Petitioners,
154 vs.
R. S. Sterling, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Kirby Fitzpatrick and Mr. James A. Reed for the petitioners, and by Mr. John G. Logue for the respondents.

American Trust Company, Petitioner,
155 vs.
American Railway Express Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur L. Gillion, Mr. Roland Obenchain, Mr. Samuel O. Pickens, and Mr. R. F. Davidson for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. S. Marx and Mr. A. M. Hartung for the respondent.

Carlotta L. Cowles, et al., etc., Petitioners,
156 vs.
Thomas F. Reddy, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ray M. Stanley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Horace L. Cheyney and Mr. John C. Crawley for the respondents.

Louisville Cooperage Company, Petitioner,
157 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elwood Hamilton and Mr. J. C. W. Beckham, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Hayner N. Larson, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Petitioner, 160 vs. Estate of Henry S. Paul.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Schnader and Mr. Philip S. Moyer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Leon J. Obermayer for the respondent
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union No. 134, et al., Petitioners, 161 vs. Western Union Telegraph Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Floyd E. Thompson, Mr. Henry Jackson Darby, and Mr. Hope Thompson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Francis Raymond Stark for the respondent
United States of America ex rel. Aspasia Polymeris, et al., Petitioners, 162 vs. Joseph W. Trudell, Immigration Inspector in Charge.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold Van Riper for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.
Joseph A. Caples, Petitioner, 164 vs. Doloras M. Caples.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred C. Knollenberg for the petitioner, and by Mr. Chiles P. Plummer for the respondent.

Valley National Bank of Chambersburg, Pa., et al., Petitioners,
167 vs.
John P. Stover.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Douglass D. Storey for the petitioners, and by Mr. Walter K. Sharpe for the respondent.

Frank O. LeDuc, Personally, etc., Petitioner,
168 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Warren E. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Whiteney North Seymour, Mr. J. Frank Staley, and Mr. W. Clifton Stone for the respondent.

Marine Transit Corporation, et al., Petitioners,
172 vs.
Louis Louis Dreyfus, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace L. Cheyney for the petitioner, and by Mr. George V. A. McCloskey for the respondent.

Ivan L. Skeen, Petitioner,
173 vs.
Beulah V. Lynch, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Conlon for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. B. Ames, Mr. J. M. Hervey, and Mr. Edward M. Freeman for the respondents.

Eddie Norris,
Petitioner,
175 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. M. Hanley and Mr. Francis Murphy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Hamburg Insurance Company of Hamburg, Germany,
Petitioner,
176 vs.
James A. Beha, Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hartwell Cabell for the petitioner, and by Mr. LeRoy B. Iserman and Mr. Alfred C. Bennett for the respondent.

Beneficial Loan Society of Bethlehem,
Petitioner,
177 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jackson R. Collins, Mr. Samuel A. Syme, and Mr. Edmund R. Beckwith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. R. C. Williamson, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Herbert S. Daniel, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
179 vs.
Guaranty Trust Company of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Halleck F. Rose, Mr. Arthur R. Wells, Mr. Winthrop B. Lane, and Mr. Paul L. Martin for the petitioner, and by Mr. William C. Dorsey for the respondent.

Faber, Coe & Gregg, Inc., Petitioner,
180 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James L. Gerry for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Charles D. Lawrence, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Ralph Folks, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Marblehead Land Company, et al., Petitioners,
181 vs.
City of Los Angeles.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar Lawler and Mr. M. F. Mitchell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Erwin P. Werner and Mr. Frederick von Schrader for the respondent.

Mrs. Lotta F. Jacobs, et al., Petitioners,
182 vs.
First National Bank of Shreveport, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles E. Dunbar for the petitioners.

Minidoka Irrigation District, Petitioner,
183 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. W. Clements and Mr. Lawrence H. Cake for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. A. G. Iverson for the respondent.

Baltimore and Philadelphia Steamboat Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
185 vs.
Augustus P. Norton, Deputy Commissioner, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Vernon S. Jones, Mr. Ira A. Campbell, Mr. Cletus Keating, and Mr. Raymond Parmer for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. C. M. Hester, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

En-le-te-ke, Charlie Harjo, et al.,
Petitioners,
186 vs.
W. A. Beasley, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. B. Campbell for the petitioners.

J. Aron & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
187 vs.
Panama Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of New York County, State of New York, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace T. Atkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Richard Reid Rogers for the respondent.

Fred E. Turner, Individually, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
188 vs.
Effie T. Kirkwood.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard William Stoutz for the petitioners.

John W. Jarvis, [illegible], Petitioner,
189 vs.
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Douglass for the petitioner, and by Mr. Bruce Scott, Mr. Douglas W. Robert, and Mr. J. C. James for the respondent.

United States Gypsum Company, Petitioner,
191 vs.
Plastoid Products, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Arnold Brand and Mr. Arthur A. Olson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert J. Fihe for the respondent.

City of Corpus Christi, Texas, Petitioner,
192 vs.
Corpus Christi Gas Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gordon Boone for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. J. Brooks and Mr. Howard Templeton for the respondent.

Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
193 vs.
R. A. Hamilton;
Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
194 vs.
R. A. Hamilton.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the petitioner, in No. 193; by Mr. Murray Allen for the petitioner in No. 194, and by Mr. Robert N. Simms and Mr. Clyde A. Douglass for the respondent.

Claude Neon Southern Corporation, et al., Petitioners,
196 vs.
W. T. McCaffrey, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Scott M. Loftin, Mr. John P. Stokes, and Mr. James E. Calkins for the petitioners.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Petitioner,
197 vs.
Shamrock Towing Company, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark and Mr. Van Vechten Veeder for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward Ash and Mr. Horace L. Cheyney for the respondents.

Illinois Power and Light Corporation, Petitioner,
199 vs.
J. T. Hurley, et al., Trustees, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas F. Doran and Mr. Thomas M. Pierce for the petitioner, and by Mr. John S. Leahy for the respondents.

Harry M. Blackmer, Petitioner,
200 vs.
The United States of America;
Harry M. Blackmer, Petitioner,
201 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic DeC. Faust, Mr. Charles F. Wilson, Mr. George Gordon Battle, and Mr. Karl C. Schuyler for the petitioner and by Mr. Leo A. Rover, Mr. Atlee Pomerene, and Mr. Frank Harrison for the respondents.

Joseph H. Hanson, M. D., Petitioner,
202 vs.
Michigan State Board of Registration in Medicine.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg and Mr. Louis M. Denit for the petitioner.

Edward Da Rosa, Petitioner,
203 vs.
The United States of America;
Edward Da Rosa, Petitioner,
204 vs.
The United States of America.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest Spagnoli for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Nitro Chemical Corporation, Petitioner,
205 vs.
The United States;

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the respondent.

Sunny Brook Distillery Company, Petitioner,
206 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Levi Cooke for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

American Monorail Company,
Petitioner,
207 vs.
A. Stanford Lyon, Judge of the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Hogan, Mr. Maurice H. Winger, and Mr. Edmund L. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. I. N. Watson, Mr. Henry N. Ess, Mr. Powell C. Groner, and Mr. Paul Barnett for the respondent.

City of Paris, Tennessee,
Petitioner,
208 vs.
Kentucky-Tennessee Light and Power Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. H. Porter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. Marshall Bullitt for the respondent.

John Peter Buren,
Petitioner,
209 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Peter Buren, pro se, and by Mr. Peter F. Dunne and Mr. Guy V. Shoup for the respondent.

Josie D. Harkins, et al.,
Petitioners,
210 vs.
Helena M. Johnson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Martin for the petitioners, and by Mr. B. M. James and Mr. Joe Hobson for the respondent.

L. Meisenhelder, as General Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
211 vs.
H. E. Byram, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mortimer H. Boutelle and Mr. Frederick M. Miner for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. W. Root, Mr. A. C. Erdall, and Mr. C. S. Jefferson for the respondents.

Union Trust Company, of Rochester, New York, as Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
212 vs.
James C. Ayer, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Archibald H. Jordan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Raymond M. White for the respondents.

Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Company, Petitioner,
213 vs.
Wilbur Bevin, by his Guardian, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur C. Spencer, Mr. Charles H. Bates, and Mr. Henry W. Clark for the petitioner.

C. W. Colgrove, et al., Petitioners,
214 vs.
Leo H. Lowe, Individually, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Cornelius J. Doyle for the petitioners, and by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom and Mr. Montgomery S. Winning for the respondents.

American Flyer Mfg. Co.,
Petitioner,
215 vs.
L. Gessford Handy and The Lionel Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David P. Wolhaupter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert C. Watson for the respondents.

James McWilliams Blue Line, Inc., et al.,
Petitioners,
216 vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Owner of the Steamtug "Brinton," etc.;
Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Owner, etc.,
Petitioner,
244 vs.
James McWilliams Blue Line, Inc., et al.;
Long Beach-on-the-Ocean, Inc.,
Petitioner,
264 vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company, as Owner, etc.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Anthony V. Lynch for the petitioner in No. 216; by Mr. Chaunc I. Clark for the petitioner in No. 244; by Mr. Warner Pyne for the petitioner in No. 264; and by Mr. Warner Pyne, Mr. George V. A. McCloskey, Mr. Leo J. Curre and Mr. Anthony V. Lynch, Jr., for the respondent, in No. 244.

William Stevens,
Petitioner,
217 vs.
The Vessel "White City," etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William F. Purdy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sanford H. Cohen for the respondent.

Winchester Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
218 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank S. Bright, Mr. William L. Rawls, Mr. H. Stanley Hinrichs, and Mr. Raymond S. Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. James A. Cosgrove for the respondent.

Reginald A. Fessenden,
Petitioner,
219 vs.
Richard H. Wilson and John P. Schafer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Reginald A. Fessenden, pro se, and by Mr. DeWitt C. Tanner for the respondents.

G. Bryan Pitts,
Petitioner,
221 vs.
William L. Peak.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Morris Wampler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. Neil Burkinshaw for the respondent.

Interstate Transit Company,
Petitioner,
222 vs.
Norman Rogers.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Annette Abbott Adams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis Carr for the respondent.

Artie T. Wells, Petitioner, 224 vs. The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. B. Newcomb for the petitioner, and by Mr. Fred C. Rector for the respondent.
John S. Phipps, Petitioner, 225 vs. Frank C. Bowers, as Executor, etc.; Henry C. Phipps, Petitioner, 226 vs. Frank C. Bowers, as Executor, etc.; Howard Phipps, Petitioner, 227 vs. Frank C. Bowers, as Executor, etc.; Helen Martin, Petitioner, 228 vs. Frank C. Bowers, as Executor, etc.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Titus for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor Gener Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Miss Helen R. Carloss, Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., and Mr. C. M Charest for the respondent.
Arthur Carr, Petitioner, 229 vs. W. S. Kingsbury, as Chief of the Division of State Lands, etc.; Roy Maggart, Petitioner, 230 vs. W. S. Kingsbury, as Chief of the Division of State Lands, etc.; F. L. Feisthamel, Petitioner, 231 vs. W. S. Kingsbury, as Chief of the Division of State Lands, etc.; C. C. Cummings, Petitioner, 232 vs. W. S. Kingsbury, as Chief of the Division of State Lands, etc.; Thomas A. Joyner, Petitioner, 233 vs. W. S. Kingsbury, as Chief of the Division of State Lands, etc.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein /to the District Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Bush for the petitioners, and by Mr. U. S. Webb for the respondent.

Stephen R. Jones, et al.,
Petitioners,
234 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry J. Gerrity for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. T. H. Lewis, Jr., Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company,
Petitioner,
235 vs.
Lancashire Shipping Company, Ltd.;
Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company,
Petitioner,
236 vs.
Tokio Marine & Fire Insurance Company;
Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company,
Petitioner,
237 vs.
Standard Transportation Company;
Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company,
Petitioner,
238 vs.
Standard Oil Company of New York.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Courtland Palmer for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Whitefield Betts, Jr., and Mr. Leonard J. Matteson for the respondents.

Mrs. J. C. Pugh, as Executrix, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
239 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rush L. Holland, Mr. George E. Strong, Mr. Frank J. Looney, and Mr. Judson M. Grimmet for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Hayner H. Larson, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

R. E. Allen, Receiver of Public Sales Corporation,
Petitioner,
240 vs.
A. N. Kelly, Assessor of Yuma County, Arizona, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Webster for the petitioner, and by Mr. K. Berry Peterson for the respondent.

The People of Porto Rico,
Petitioner,
241 vs.
Clara Livingston.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Cattron Rigby and Mr. Blanton Winship for the petitioner, and by Mr. Carroll C. Walter for the respondent.

Jesse H. Denton,
Petitioner,
242 vs.
Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John P. Bramhall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles N. Burch, Mr. R. V. Fletcher, Mr. A. S. Bozeman, and Mr. C. H. McKay for the respondents.

Mary Bohenik, Individually, etc.,
Petitioner,
243 vs.
The Delaware & Hudson Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sol Gelb for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. T. Newcomb and Mr. Carl E. Whitney for the respondent.

Anna Beaver Hallam,
Petitioner,
246 vs.
Commerce Mining and Royalty Company, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Howell for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. Scott Thompson, Mr. Ray McNaughton, Mr. George S. Ramsey, and Mr. F. D. Adams for the respondents.

Subhi Mustafa Sadi,
Petitioner,
247 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Max J. Kohler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Mrs. George G. Snowden, et al.,
Petitioner,
248 vs.
Red River and Bayou Des Glasier Levee, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mrs. George G. Snowden, pro se.

Tennessee Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
249 vs.
Cecil Thompson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. A. Fowler for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. T. Kennerly for the respondent.

Peter H. Miller, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., Petitioner,

251 vs.

The Standard Nut Margarine Company of Florida.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. A. H. Conner for the petitioner, and by Mr. George N. Murdock, Mr. A. Y. Milam, and Mr. Robert R. Milam for the respondent.

Josiah T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

252 vs.

The Standard Nut Margarine Company of Florida.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. George N. Murdock and Mr. James C. Davis for the respondent.

Ed. S. Vail Butterine Co., Petitioner,

292 vs.

Mabel C. Reinecke, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George N. Murdock for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. S. Dee Hanson for the respondent.

Annie C. Slaughter, Petitioner,

253 vs.

C. C. Slaughter Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. M. Chambers for the petitioner.

Charles E. Havener,
Petitioner,
256 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Johnson and Mr. Donald W. Johnson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

E. C. Riegel,
Petitioner,
257 vs.
The Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Riegel, pro se.

Central Pacific Railway Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
258 vs.
County of Alameda, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby, Mr. Frank Thunen, and Mr. Guy V. Shoup for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. P. Wittschen for the respondents.

Paul Graffe,
Petitioner,
259 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel A. King for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioners,
260 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. F. Dammann for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. John G. Remey for the respondent.

Omaha and City National Bank,
Petitioner,
261 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Price for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. J. Louis Monarch for the respondent.

Fort Worth Independent School District,
Petitioner,
262 vs.
Aetna Casualty & Surety Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert M. Rowland for the petitioner and by Mr. John T. Pearson for the respondent.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
263 vs.
Clarence Bezue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward R. Brumley and Mr. John M. Gibbons for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill and Mr. Charles D. Lewis for the respondent.

L. A. Nixon, Petitioner,
265 vs.
James Condon and C. H. Kolle.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James Marshall, Mr. Arthur Spingarn, Mr. Nathan B. Margold, and Mr. Fred C. Knollenberg for the petitioner.

Life & Casualty Insurance Company of Tennessee, Petitioner,
267 vs.
Cuba Heathcott, by next friend;
Life & Casualty Insurance Company of Tennessee, Petitioner,
268 vs.
Cuba Heathcott, by next friend.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court and to the Court of Civil Appeals of the State of Tennessee was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Carlton Loser for the petitioner.

Sidney Z. Mitchell, Petitioner,
269 vs.
The Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Graham Sumner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

J. B. Davis, Petitioner,
271 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Berne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Realty Acceptance Corporation,
Petitioner,
314 vs.
Henry G. Montgomery.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles F. Curley and Mr. R. Randolph Hicks for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert H. Richards and Mr. Thomas J. Crawford for the respondent.

Merritt J. Corbett,
Petitioner,
272 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Hughes and Mr. William Cogger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. John G. Remey, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Cleveland-Cliffs Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
273 vs.
Cargill Grain Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tracy H. Duncan, Mr. Frederick L. Leckie, and Mr. Edgar W. McPherran for the petitioner.

Joseph A. Diamond and Esther A. Diamond,
Petitioners,
274 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter Bachrach and Mr. Benjamin C. Bachrach for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank H. Scott, Mr. Homer H. Cooper, and Mr. Louis H. Cooke for the respondent.

Frommel Realty and Investment Co., et al., Petitioners,
275 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Ash for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. William Cutler Thompson, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Canal Steel Works, Inc., Petitioner,
276 vs.
One Drag Line Dredge.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nicholas G. Carbajal for the petitioner.

The Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Company of California, Petitioner,
277 vs.
Wanda Roberta Barton, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. L. Doggett and Mr. Charles Cook Howell for the petitioner.

Mary A. Lineberry, Petitioner,
278 vs.
Woodward & Lothrop;
Willie E. Lineberry, Petitioner,
279 vs.
Woodward & Lothrop.

The petition for a writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard L. Merrick and Mr. Elwood P. Morey for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. John S. Flannery, and Mr. C. Bowdoin Craighill for the respondent.

Joseph Engelsberg,
Petitioner,
280 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. D. Stewart for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Benjamin Gitlow, as President of "Revolutionary Age," etc.,
Petitioner,
281 vs.
John J. Kiely, Postmaster of the City of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur G. Hays for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

Norman S. Bowles,
Petitioner,
282 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Philip Hill for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

W. C. Ray and W. M. Davidson,
Petitioners,
283 vs.
Silver Springs Paradise Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry J. Richardson for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. P. Adair for the respondent.

Otto F. Gluck,
Petitioner,
284 vs.
Lillian Kemper.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter H. Saunders and Mr. J. L. London for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar Habenicht for the respondent.

The Chemical Foundation, Inc.,
Petitioner,
285 vs.
General Electric Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh M. Morris, Mr. John F. Neary, and Mr. Louis W. McKernan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles Neave and Mr. Stephen H. Philbin for the respondent.

Dow V. Walker and August Wemme,
Petitioners,
288 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James J. Crossley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General St. Lewis, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. Thos. E. Rhodes for the respondent.

Basil Robillard, as Executor, etc.,
Petitioner,
289 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Basil Robillard for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. A. H. Conner for the respondent.

A. D. Burrowes, Receiver, etc., Petitioner, vs. Bertha Goodman, Executrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis L. Driscoll for the petitioner.
290	
Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Mack Saxon, Ancillary Administrator, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. H. Culwell, Mr. E. E. McInnis, and Mr. Wm. H. Burges for the petitioner, and by Mr. Winbourn Pearce for the respondent.
291	
City Button Works, Petitioner, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald Horne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Thacher, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John H. McEvers for the respondent.
293	
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Howes Brothers Hide Company, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John Henry McEvers, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert A. Littleton for the respondents.
294	

Sallie M. Wise, Petitioner,
295 vs.
N. L. Miller, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. T. Stokely and Mr. S. P. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Needham A. Graham, Jr., for the respondent.

United States Navigation Company, Inc., Petitioner,
296 vs.
The Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Mark W. Maclay and Mr. John Tilney Carpenter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper and Mr. Charles C. Burlingham for the respondent.

Mrs. Iris Christine Bergholm, et al., Petitioners,
297 vs.
Peoria Life Insurance Company of Peoria, Illinois.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Tom Connally for the petitioners.

The Wadsworth Electric Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
298 vs.
The Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas G. Haight and Mr. Walter F. Murray for the petitioner, and by Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the respondent.

Enrique Monserrat,
Petitioner,
299 vs.
Alfredo Carmelo and Ramon Oriol.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clyde Alton DeWitt and Mr. Eugene Arthur Perkins for the petitioner.

Georgios or George Fafalios,
Petitioner,
302 vs.
William N. Doak, Secretary of Labor.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ward Bonsall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, and Mr. Albert E. Reitzel for the respondent.

Charles E. Stratton, et al.,
Executors, Petitioners,
303 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. Philip Wardner for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe for the respondent.

Lamont Miller, Petitioner,
304 vs.
The United States of America;
Clinton Hoffman, Petitioner,
305 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Patrick J. Friel for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Warren and Arthur Smadbeck, Inc., Petitioner,
306 vs.
Heling Contracting Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marion DeVries and Mr. Samuel J. Rawak for the petitioner, and by Mr. John W. Griffin and Mr. Warthon Poor for the respondent.

Herman M. Diamond, Petitioner,
307 vs.
John J. McMahon.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals of the State of New Jersey was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas G. Haight for the petitioner.

St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company, Petitioner,
311 vs.
Sophia C. Bachmann.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip P. Steptoe and Mr. Louis A. Johnson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Carl G. Bachmann, Mr. Charles J. Schuck, and Mr. J. Bernard Handlan for the respondent.

Bessie D. Laughlin, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
312 vs.
Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joshua R. H. Potts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, and Mr. T. A. Hostetler for the respondent.

George M. Wright and William A. Morehead,
Petitioners,
313 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. C. McDonald for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. Wm. Cutler Thompson, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,
Petitioner,
315 vs.
Wilton McCarthy.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse A. Miller and Mr. James C. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles S. Bradshaw for the respondent.

Heyman Rosenberg and Parker-Kalon Corporation,
Petitioner,
316 vs.
Carr Fastener Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar M. Kitchin, Mr. David L. Podell, Mr. Edmund Quincy Moses, and Mr. Jacob J. Podell for the petitioners, and by Mr. L. G. Miller for the respondent.

The Indemnity Insurance Company of North America, et al.,
Petitioners,
317 vs.
N. L. Levering.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. M. Ozias for the petitioners, and by Mr. Hiram E. Booth for the respondent.

Leoncio C. Belisario, Petitioner, 318 vs. The People of the Philippine Islands.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leoncio C. Belisario pro se, and by Mr. William Catron Rigby and Mr. Blanton Winship for the respondent.
The Onondaga Company, Petitioner, 320 vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue; The Ten Eyck Company, Petitioner, 321 vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. C. Murphy for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. John Henry McEvers, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.
Jonathan Godfrey, Petitioner, 322 vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue; Estate of Charles G. Waldo, deceased, Petitioner, 323 vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harvey K. Zollinger and Mr. Marion W. Ripy for the petitioners and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. Morton K. Rothschild for the respondent.

Mary E. Hanlon, Petitioner,
326 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
Mrs. Elizabeth Henaghan, Petitioner,
327 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Josephus C. Trimble and Mr. Jerry A. Mathews for the petitioners and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. Norman D. Keller for the respondent.

William Lias, et al.,
Petitioners,
328 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Bernard Handlan and Mr. John Marshall for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.

Phil Gollenger, Petitioner,
329 vs.
The United States of America;
John Antonsan, Petitioner,
330 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gerald A. Gillett for the petitioners and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, and Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the respondent.

Manuel V. Domenech, Treasurer of Porto Rico, Petitioner,
331 vs.
Porto Rican Leaf Tobacco Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Cattron Rigby and Mr. Blanton Winship for the petitioner, and by Mr. William M. Parker and ~~Mr. J. Arthur Love~~ for the respondent.

J. Howard Leman, Administrator C. T. A., etc., et al., Petitioners,
332 vs.
Krentler-Arnold Hinge Last Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ellis Spear, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Robert Cushman and Mr. Otto F. Barthel for the respondent.

Spring Canyon Coal Company, Petitioner,
334 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
Spring Canyon Coal Company, Petitioner,
335 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Hamel and Mr. John Enrietto for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. J. P. Jackson for the respondent.

City of Willow Glen, Petitioner,
336 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Casper A. Ornbaun for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank C. Cleary and Mr. E. J. Foulds for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 341 vs. Coronado Oil and Gas Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. Rayner N. Larson for the petitioner.
National Tank Seal Company, Petitioner, 342 vs. Johns-Manville Corporation.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard Wm. Stoutz for the petitioner, and by Mr. Odin Roberts for the respondent.
The North American Coal Corporation, Petitioner, 343 vs. The Wheeling and Lake Erie Railway Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. H. Hoppe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert E. Powell and Mr. Andrew P. Martin for the respondent.
Mari Tollefsen Todok and Knute C. Engen, Petitioners, 344 vs. Union State Bank of Harvard, Harvard, Nebraska, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Edgerton for the petitioners and by Mr. Walter D. James and Mr. Frank D. Williams for the respondent.

Benjamin L. Allen,
Petitioner,
345 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sterling Halstead and Mr. Martin A. Schenck for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. Morton K. Rothschild for the respondent.

Buick Motor Company,
Petitioner,
346 vs.
City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Thomas Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Niven, Mr. Walter J. Mattison, and Mr. Theo. W. Brazeau for the respondents.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,
Petitioner,
347 vs.
State of Kansas at the Relation and to the Use of the Winkle Terra Cotta Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eugene S. Quinton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas W. White for the respondent.

Old Colony Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
349 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James S. Y. Irvins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Miss Helen R. Carloss for the respondent.

Amante Rongetti, Petitioner, 350 vs. The State of Illinois.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles P. R. Machaulay for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom for the respondent.
S. P. Knut, Individually, etc., et al. Petitioners, 351 vs. Patrick Henry, Executor, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. P. Knut for the petitioners, and by Mr. Gerard Brandon for the respondent.
S. P. Knut, Individually, etc., et al., Petitioners, 352 vs. Elizabeth H. Forsyth, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. P. Knut for the petitioners, and by Mr. Gerard Brandon for the respondents.
August J. Schick, Petitioner, 353 vs. City of New Orleans, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claude L. Johnson for the petitioner.

William H. Leland, et al.,
Petitioners,
354 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harris H. Gilman and Mr. Merrill S. June for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Miss Helen R. Carloss, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Frank Collis Bowers, as Executor, etc.,
Petitioner,
355 vs.
Lawyers Mortgage Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. Hayner N. Larson, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. John A. Garver for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
356 vs.
Home Title Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. Hayner N. Larson, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hugh Satterlee for the respondent.

Louis B. Eubank, et al.,
Petitioners,
359 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis B. Eubank for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Kathryn T. Long,
Petitioner,
360 vs.
Frederick H. Rike, individually, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hobart P. Young and Mr. Harris C. Lutkin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank H. Scott and Mr. Tappan Gregory for the respondents.

Nicola Ranieri,
Petitioner,
361 vs.
S. D. Smith, District Director in Charge of Immigration at Chicago, Illinois, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Chumbley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondents.

Seaboard Oil Company,
Petitioner,
362 vs.
Fred B. Cunningham.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin H. Long and Mr. Julian Hartridge for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert L. Shipp for the respondent..

R. V. Board,
Petitioner,
363 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elwood Hamilton and Mr. J. C. W. Beckham, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. John Mac C. Hudson for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
365 vs.
Sophia David, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas Hackney, Mr. Edward J. White, and Mr. Leslie A. Welch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Horace Guffin for the respondent.

Mrs. Niels (Mellie) Esperson Stewart,
Executrix, etc., Petitioner,
366 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. F. Louis for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. Norman D. Keller for the respondent.

Mrs. Niels (Mellie) Esperson,
Petitioner,
367 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue;
Mrs. Niels (Mellie)Esperson,
Executrix, etc., Petitioner,
368 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. F. Louis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. John C. Remey for the respondents.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General
of Railroads, as Agent, etc.,
Petitioner,
369 vs.
China Fire Insurance Company, Ltd. etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward N. Abbey and Mr. Russell H. Robbins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar R. Houston and Mr. Arthur W. Clement for the respondent.

The Lamson Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
370 vs.
H. H. Whittemore, Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. Crosby Kindleberger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Horace E. Gunn for the respondent.

Geronimo Ramirez,
Petitioner,
373 vs.
The State of Texas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Criminal Appeals of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Shelley for the petitioner.

South Florida Lumber Mills,
Petitioner,
392 vs.
Jules Breuchaud.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. B. K. Pettingill for the petitioner, and by Mr. O. K. Reaves for the respondent.

D. T. Blodgett, as Taxpayer, etc.,
Petitioner,
399 vs.
Wm. D. Dehy, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court for the County of Santa Barbara, State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. T. Blodgett pro se, and by Mr. John William Heaney and Mr. Francis Price for the respondents.

The Chief Justice announced:

The Court will now adjourn to meet upon Monday next, October 12, when arguments in cases especially set and cases on the regular docket will be commenced. The Court will thus be enabled to devote time during the next week to the disposition of the petitions for certiorari which are submitted today.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice.
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Adrien F. Busick, It is ordered that Andrew Paul Federline, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene M. O'Neill, It is ordered that Homer C. Fulton, Esquire, of Duluth, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Mark Trice, It is ordered that Howard F. Cline, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Claudian B. Northrop, It is ordered that H. Gordon Chute, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Mark Trice, It is ordered that Frederick C. Kurth, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Schwertne It is ordered that Joseph Jacobs, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry McCall, It is ordered that Robert E. Milling, Jr., Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Alden, It is ordered that Sidney Newborg, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eskil C. Carlson, It is ordered that George A. Wilson, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Stein, It is ordered that Florence A. Quintin, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph Stein, It is ordered that John Bird Quintin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert T. Scott, It is ordered that Alex Glick, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Emory H. Niles, It is ordered that Hubert Blalock, Esquire, of West Hartford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Northcutt Ely, It is ordered that Frank Delaney, Esquire, of Glenwood Springs, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eskil C. Carlson, It is ordered that Charles Hutchinson, Esquire, of Des Moines, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leo P. Day, It is ordered that Anthony P. Donadio, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur A. Olson, It is ordered that George William Hansen, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur A. Olson, It is ordered that Sidney Neuman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur A. Olson, It is ordered that Albert Huntington Pendleton, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that John C. Cung'l, Esquire, of Tucson, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Freeman, It is ordered that John St. Paul, Jr., Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Guy Mason, It is ordered that C. Frank Lipper, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that Justin Winfred Shrader, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. A. Youngquist, It is ordered that Burton J. Wyman, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton W. King, It is ordered that William Joachim, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence B. Des Jardins, It is ordered that Howard P. Williamson, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Reed, It is ordered that Ralph C. Davis, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David A. Reed, It is ordered that Thomas Stephen Brown, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel W. McIntosh, It is ordered that George W. Ferguson, Esquire, of Cheyenne, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced:

In view of the large number of such orders, the orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted and upon applications for writs of certiorari, as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the Clerk of the Court.

—, Original.

In re disbarment of

Harold J. Bandy.

It being represented to the Court that Harold J. Bandy, of Granite City, State of Illinois, a member of the Bar of this Court, did, on September 11, 1931, cause the case of Harry Blockburger v. The United States of America to be docketed in this Court as No. 374, October Term, 1931, and did, on September 19, 1931, formally enter his appearance in this Court in that cause as counsel for the petitioner; that, for the purpose of complying with the rules of this Court requiring that the Clerk shall in all cases be satisfied as to the payment of fees and costs, the said Harold J. Bandy sent to the Clerk of this Court, under dates of September 7, 1931, and September 16, 1931, his checks for $10 and for $75, respectively, as deposits to secure the payment of esti ated Clerk's fees and printing costs in said cause; that payment of said checks was refused by the drawee bank and that the said checks were returned to the Clerk marked "Insufficient funds"; that the said Bandy has failed to reply to, and has refused to pay the charges upon, a telegram sent to him by the Clerk on September 28, 1931, in respect to such checks, and has failed to reply to a letter addressed to him by the Clerk on September 29, 1931, on the same subject, or to a further letter, dated October 7, 1931, in which the Clerk earnestly requested him to make immediate reply, since the petition of the said Blockburger for a writ of certiorari would be due for submission to this Court on Monday, October 12, 1931,

Now, therefore, It is ordered that the said Harold J. Bandy show cause, if any there be, on or before Monday, October 26th next, by written response to this rule, why his name should not be stricken from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice before the bar of this Court, on the ground that he has failed to demean himself, as an attorney and counsellor of this Court, uprightly, and according to law, in keeping with the obligation of his oath.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.

Ex Parte: James Edward Murphy,

Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.

Ex Parte: Richard Husty,

Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State of Wisconsin, et al., Complainants,

5, Original. vs.

The State of Illinois, et al.;

The State of Michigan, et al., Complainants,

8, Original. vs.

The State of Illinois, et al.;

The State of New York, et al., Complainants,

9, Original. vs.

The State of Illinois, et al.

ORDER

The semi-annual report of the defendants, dated July 1, 1931, is received and ordered to be filed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commonwealth of Kentucky, Complainant,

11, Original. vs.

State of Indiana, et al.

ORDER.

Report No. 3 of the defendant, dated August 29, 1931, is received and ordered to be filed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner,

484, October Term, 1930. vs.

Raladam Company.

On consideration of the motion by counsel for the Federal Trade Commission to modify the judgment of this Court by adding thereto a direction to the Circuit Court of Appeals to modify its decree so as to provide that the decree of reversal is without prejudice to further proceedings before the Commission in this cause (1) for the taking of additional evidence as to respondent's competitors and as to the injury to competitors resulting from respondent's unfair trade practices, and (2) for the making of further findings of fact and a further order based on such additional evidence,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice to application to the Circuit Court of Appeals for similar relief.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John M. Brant Company, Petitioner,

454, October Term, 1930. vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for rehearing in this case out of time,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Painters District Council No. 14 of

Chicago and Vicinity of the Brotherhood

of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers

of America, et al., Appellants,

41 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the suggestion of a diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari in this case,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Petitioner,

60 vs.

Eugene Bolle.

On consideration of the suggestion of a diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari in this case,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Hide and Leather Company, Petitioner,

62 vs.

The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago and Eastern Illinois R. R. Co., Petitioner,

79 vs.

Industrial Commission of Illinois and Joe Thomas.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Cook County, State of Illinois is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Matson Navigation Company,
Petitioner,
137 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
86 vs.
Richard R. Churchill, Administrator of the Estate of Roy W. Brown, Deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court, 1st District, State of Illinois, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
87 vs.
Richard R. Churchill, Administrator of the Estate of Roy W. Brown, Deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arizona Grocery Company,
Petitioner,
98 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edgar Percy Lewis, and Richard F. Cooper, as Trustees under the Will of Arthur Francis Thomas Cooper, Deceased,
Petitioners,
115 vs.
Marshall S. Reynolds, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad Company and the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company,
Petitioners,
130 vs.
Ben Terte, Judge of the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri, at Kansas City.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America, ex rel. Aspasia Polymeris and Antigone Polymeris, Petitioners,
162 vs.
Joseph W. Trudell, Immigration Inspector in Charge.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Marine Transit Corporation and Tug "Gerald A; Fagan," by Marine Transit Corporation, Claimant, Petitioner,
172 vs.
Louis Louis Dreyfus and Charles Louis Dreyfus, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Rocky Brook Mills Company, Petitioner,
47 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Rocky Brook Mills Company,
Petitioner,
47 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for additional findings,
It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Earl L. Fisher, Charles V. Galloway and John H. Carkin, Tax Commissioners of the State of Oregon, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
61 vs.
Scott Redfield and Berwick B. Wood, co-partners, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Willie Tiger and Alexander George,
Petitioners,
65 vs.
Emory Timmons, Alene Timmons and Prairie Oil and Gas Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

M. Hohenberg, et al., Co-partners,
Trading as M. Hohenberg & Co.,
Petitioners,
70 vs.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad
Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western
Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
73 vs.
Duris Berry.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Walter Beck,
Petitioner,
74 vs.
Missouri Valley Drainage District of
Holt County, Missouri, et al., etc.,
et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Daniel M. Coakley, Petitioner,
75 vs.
Equitable Bank & Trust Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Akties, Dampskibsselskabet Donneborg, as Owner of the Steamship Sonderborg, et al., etc., Petitioners,
76 vs.
G. Mikkelsen, H. Olsson, J. L. Nielsen, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

G. Mikkelsen, H. Olsson, J. L. Nielsen, et al., Petitioners,
190 vs.
Akties, Dampskibsselskabet Donneborg, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

78

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Leon E. Harker, Petitioner, vs. Ralston Purina Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

81

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

I. Tanenbaum Son & Company, Petitioner, vs. Drumbor-Bingell Company, Inc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

82

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Howard Thomas, Administrator of the
Estate of Harold James Pringle,
Deceased, Petitioner,
83 vs.
Morton Salt Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Olympic Salt Water Company,
Petitioner,
90 vs.
The Shipowners and Merchants
Tugboat Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lehigh Valley Transit Company,
Petitioner,
92 vs.
Roger H. Zanes.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

M. C. Garber,

Petitioner,

93 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

L. C. Moore,

Petitioner,

94 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James Tait,

Petitioner,

95 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. F. Kistler Estate, Florence L. Kistler and L. C. Moore, Administrators, Petitioners, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

96

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Driscoll and Thomas Driscoll, Petitioners, vs. The State of Colorado, etc., et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado.

99

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hamilton Rubber Manufacturing Co., et al., Petitioners, vs. Maco Stewart, Sr., Maco Stewart, Jr., and Elmo C. Tenison. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

100

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William F. Kelly,

Petitioner,

101 vs.

The Queensboro National Bank of the City of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Samson Tire & Rubber Company,

Petitioner,

102 vs.

R. M. Eggleston, Trustee of the Estate of O. J. Umphrey Oil Co., Inc., Bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Aetna Life Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

103 vs.

Lucy G. Wharton.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

H. P. Coffee Company,
Petitioner,
104 vs.
Reid, Murdock & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles Lantz,
Petitioner,
106 vs.
Thornhill Francis Broome.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
107 vs.
Jules Emmanuel Denis Corneo, Master of the French Barque "Richelieu," etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway - Carolina Division, Petitioner, vs. Minnie L. Neal, Administratrix. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

108

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Benigno Velazquez, Petitioner, vs. R. W. Rickson, Master and Claimant of Steamship Cornucopia. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

109

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

S. J. Schneider, Trustee of the Estate of Bagby-Howe Drug Company, Petitioner, vs. Robert H. Lucas, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Kentucky. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States CircuitCourt of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

110

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Skaggs Safeway Stores, Incorporated, Petitioner, vs. Fred Dunkle. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

111

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lamont, Corliss & Co., Ponds Extract Co., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

113

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Celanese Corporation of America, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

121

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

F. B. Vandegrift & Co. (G. W. Bernstein & Sons),
Petitioners,
vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

135

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

F. M. Jabara & Bros.,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

254

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The American Foundation, Incorporated,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

255

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wilbur-Ellis Co., et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

286

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Citizens Bank of Warrenton, Petitioner, vs. Warner Moore. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

114

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James Solomont, Trustee, Petitioner, vs. O'Neill-Orr Construction Company, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

116

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Pacific Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

117 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

L. T. McCready and Maryland of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Casualty Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby,denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Automobile Insurance Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

119 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Castle, Roper - Mathews and Charles of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

H. Roper.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Nelson P. Gay, Executor of David S.

Gay, Deceased, On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court

124 vs. of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

New York Life Insurance Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harold C. Hill, Tax Assessor for the First Taxation Division of the Territory of Hawaii, Petitioner,

125 vs.

Helen Strong Carter.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Grand Trunk Western Railway Company, Petitioner,

127 vs.

Marion Heatlie, Special Administratrix of the Estate of Walter I. Heatlie, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Grand Trunk Western Railway Company, Petitioner,

128 vs.

Ida May Drew, Special Administratrix of the Estate of Ernest R. Drew, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Grand Trunk Western Railway
Company,
Petitioner,
129 vs.
James White.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles Beadon, Harry H. Phillips and
Stock Market Reporter, Inc., et al.,
Petitioners,
131 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

States Steamship Company,
Petitioner,
132 vs.
Jac Wychgel.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pueblo de San Juan,
Petitioner,
133 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Great Lakes Towing Company,
Petitioner,
134 vs.
The Kinsman Transit Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Kansas City Southern Railway Company
and Colloy Products Company,
Petitioners,
138 vs.
Silica Products Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Otto W. Klose,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

139

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arthur Lorenz,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

140

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Grays Harbor Motorship Corp.,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

141

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Excelsior Brewing, Inc., and
Pulaski Holding Co.,
Petitioners,
143 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States CircuitCourt of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ernest E. Cook, Fred Steatton,
Allie DeVere Carter, et al.,
Petitioners,
145 vs.
The Illinois Bankers Life Association, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby,denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Victor Blackwood,
Petitioner,
147 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the saidpetition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John Garcia,
Petitioner,
148 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Mutual Life Insurance Company of New York,
Petitioner,
149 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Houston Oil & Transport Company,
Petitioner,
150 vs.
Aetna Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Earl D. Bess,

Petitioner,

151 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Oglesby Coal Company,

Petitioner,

152 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James P. Jones,

Petitioner,

153 vs.

Commonwealth of Virginia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hans Gredig, et al., Petitioners, vs. R. S. Sterling, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

154

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Trust Company, Petitioner, vs. American Railway Express Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

155

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Carlotta L. Cowles and Theodore C. Knight, as Executors of the Last Will and Testament of Benjamin L. Cowles, Deceased, etc., Petitioners, vs. Thomas F. Reddy, Bethlehem Steel Company, Mary Ryan, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

156

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louisville Cooperage Company,
Petitioner,
157 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Petitioner,
160 vs.
Estate of Henry S. Paul.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union No. 134, et al.,
Petitioners,
161 vs.
Western Union Telegraph Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1931 - CONTINUED

Joseph A. Caples,
Petitioner,
164 vs.
Doloras M. Caples.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Valley National Bank of Chambersburg, Pa., and Citizens National Bank of Greencastle, Pa., etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
167 vs.
John P. Stover.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank O. LeDuc, Personally and as Special Administrator of the Estate of Roy LeDuc, Deceased, Petitioner,
168 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United StatesCircuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State of Wyoming,
Complainant,
15, Original. vs.
State of Colorado.

The motion to set this case for hearing on motion to dismiss was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Ferguson for the complainant.

The Permutit Company,
Petitioner,
3 vs.
Graver Corporation.

The motion for leave to file brief of the Duro Company, as amicus curiae, was submitted by Mr. Howard P. Williamson in that behalf, and the motion was denied.

Sigmund Ornstein and Louis Ornstein,
Appellants,
44 vs.
The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred C. Rector for the appellee.

Andrew B. Keating, as Receiver of Taxes, etc.,
Appellants,
71 vs.
The Public National Bank of New York.

The motion to dismiss or affirm was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Martin Saxe, Mr. Henry L. Moses, Mr. Robert C. Beatty and Mr. Herman G. Kopald for the appellee, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly, Mr. William Herbert King, and Mr. Eugene Fay for the appellants, in opposition thereto.

Public Service Commission of Indiana, et al.,
Appellants,
120 vs.
Batesville Telephone Company.

The motion to dismiss or affirm was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Thompson and Mr. Albert L. Rabb for the appellee.

John F. Hanson,
Appellant,
266 vs.
Otto A. Hanson, individually, etc.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Hanson, pro se.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1931 - CONTINUED

David Threatt,
Petitioner,
446 vs.
American Mutual Liability Insurance Co. et al.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David Threatt pro se.

Twin City Power Company,
Petitioner,
142 vs.
Savannah River Electric Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. W. Robinson, Mr. George E. O'Connor, and Mr. E. H. Callaway for the petitioner, and by Mr. M. C. McDonald for the respondent.

William Courtney Taylor, et al.,
Petitioners,
198 vs.
American Liability Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Kerr and Mr. A. K. Shipe for the petitioners, and by Mr. Beverley R. Jouett for the respondent.

The Chase National Bank of the City of New York,
Petitioner,
364 vs.
City of Sanford, Florida.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Root Stern, Mr. H. C. Pickering, Mr. James F. Soudefur, and Mr. Bertram F. Shipman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles A. Boston and Mr. Lucien H. Boggs for the respondent.

George Davidson,

Petitioner,

375 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel T. Hagan and ~~Mr. James S. Y. Irvine~~ for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. A. W. Henderson, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

George M. Phillips,

Petitioner,

376 vs.

Union Terminal Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein /to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John G. Parkinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert A. Brown for the respondent.

Charles E. Forsythe, et al.,

Petitioners,

377 vs.

James Tregarthen & Sons Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel D. Stein for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward Ash for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

378 vs.

Chicago Portrait Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe for the petitioner.

Taylor-Moore Syndicate, Inc., et al.,
Petitioners,

379 vs.

Central Florida Lumber Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. B. K. Pettingill for the petitioners, and by Mr. Martin Sack for the respondent.

Florence C. Knollenberg,
Petitioner,

380 vs.

The State Bank of Alamogordo.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred C. Knollenberg for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. B. Holt for the respondent.

A. Schrader's Son, Inc.,
Petitioner,

382 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Sullivan, Jr., and Mr. Frank M. Avery for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John Henry McEvers for the respondent.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad
Company,
Petitioner,

383 vs.

Tom Hall.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. S. Stone and Mr. White E. Gibson for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. C. Calhoun for the respondent.

W. Bernard Vause; Petitioner,
384 vs.
The United States of America;
Samuel Schuchman, Petitioner,
386 vs.
The United States of America.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Elder for the petitioner in No. 384; by Mr. George H. Combs, Jr., for the petitioner in No. 386; and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

W. P. Allen,
Petitioner,
385 vs.
Citizens Bank & Trust Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. H. Sutherland for the petitioner, and by M. . Paul Dulaney for the respondent.

Monarch Tool & Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
388 vs.
Mills Novelty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter F. Murray for the petitioner, and by Mr. Weymouth Kirkland for the respondent.

Bradley A. Fiske,
Petitioner,
396 vs.
William A. Moffett.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond J. Mawhinney and Mr. Ernest Wilkinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher and Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1931 - CONTINUED

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
397 vs.
Mamie Lee Derrington, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. L. E. Jeffries, Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. R. J. Kramer, and Mr. Bruce A. Campbell for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. H. Douglass for the respondent.

Chicago & North Western Railway Company,
Petitioner,
417 vs.
George C. Struthers, as Special Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel H. Cady and Mr. William T. Faricy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Tom Davis and Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondent.

Sigmund Ornstein and Louis Ornstein,
Appellants,
44 vs.
The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stuart R. Bolin for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. Fred C. Rector of the appellees, in opposition thereto.

C. W. Palm,
Appellant,
53 vs.
R. B. Hollopeter.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred Evan Reames for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Gus Newbury for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Sarah P. Stuart and Elizabeth K. Dodge, Appellants,
56 vs.
Charles E. Fox and Edward E. Fox;
Sarah P. Stuart and Elizabeth K. Dodge, Appellants,
57 vs.
Jessie C. Minott;
Sarah P. Stuart and Elizabeth K. Dodge, Appellants,
58 vs.
Harry M. Shwartz and Jesse M. Rosenberg.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank H. Purinton for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. Robert Hale for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

The Hodge Drive-It-Yourself Company, et al., Appellants,
63 vs.
The City of Cincinnati, et al., et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Julius H. Samuels for the appellants.

Samuel W. Baxter, as Administrator, etc., Appellant,
68 vs.
Continental Casualty Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. Taylor Bryan and Mr. Douglass H. Jones for the appellant.

Andrew B. Keating, as Receiver, etc., et al., Appellants,
71 vs.
The Public National Bank of New York.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly, Mr. William Herbert King, and Mr. Eugene Fay for the appellants.

Broad-Grace Arcade Corporation, Appellant,
72 vs.
J. Fulmer Bright, Mayor of the City of Richmond, et al., etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Andrew D. Christian for the appellant.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1931 - CONTINUED

The Chapel State Theatre Company, Appellant, 77 vs. Fred W. Hooper, Doing Business as F. W. Hooper Company.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Levi Cooke for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. R. M. Lucas for the appellee, in opposition thereto.
State of Washington ex rel. George I. Clithero, et al., Appellants, 80 vs. N. D. Showalter, etc., et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond M. Hudson and Mr. Robert L. Edmiston for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. John H. Dunbar and Mr. E. W. Anderson for the appellees, in opposition thereto.
W. L. Mathews, et al., Appellants, 84 vs. J. F. Rodgers, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. A. Lauderdale for the appellants.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, et al., Appellants, 88 vs, The United States of America, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carl H. Davis, Mr. F. B. Grier, and Mr. M. G. McDonald for the appellants.
Augusta Power Company, a Business Trust, et al., Appellants, 89 vs. Savannah River Electric Company.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the appellants.
Walnut and Quince Street Corporation, Appellants, 105 vs. William B. Mills, Superintendent of the Department of Public Safety, etc., et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maurice Bower Saul, Mr. Walter Biddle Saul, and Mr. Earl G. Harrison for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. G. Coe Farrier for

Nellie Field Burwell, Sole Devisee, etc., et al., Appellants,
112 vs.
James T. Powell and John S. Daisy.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James E. Heath for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. Wm. M. Williams for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

Fox Film Corporation, Appellant,
118 vs.
R. C. Norman, State Tax Commissioner.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. A. Sutherland for the appellant.

Public Service Commission of Indiana, et al., Appellants,
120 vs.
Batesville Telephone Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Ogden and Mr. G. W. Hufsmith for the appellants.

Champlin Refining Company, Appellant,
122 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al., etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar A. DeMeules and Mr. George S. Ramsey for the appellant.

Victor J. Passera, et al., Appellants,
136 vs.
Pontchartrain Realty Company, Inc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. C. Dufour and Mr. J. Zach Spearing for the appellants.

Twin City Power Company, Appellant,
142 vs.
Savannah River Electric Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. W. Robinson, Mr. George E. O'Connor, and Mr. E. H. Callaway for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. M. G. McDonald for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Amos Shriver,
Appellant,
158 vs.
Woodbine Savings Bank of Woodbine, Iowa.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Parsons for the appellant.

Yale Oil Corporation of South Dakota,
Appellant,
159 vs.
The State of Montana.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. Morris ~~Mr. Frederick I. Pearce~~ for the appellant.

A. H. Averill, as Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon,
Appellant,
165 vs.
Northwestern National Insurance Company of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. H. Van Winkle and Mr. Willis S. Moore for the appellant.

L. S. Brannan, et al.,
Appellants,
169 vs.
William B. Harrison, as Comptroller General, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. N. Davie for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. Robert S. Parker and Mr. T. R. Gress for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Gregg Dyeing Company, Appellant,
170 vs.
W. C. Query, et al, etc.;
The City of Greenville, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
245 vs.
W. C. Query, et al.

The statements as to jurisdiction herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. F. Henderson for the appellants.

First National Bank of Boston, Executor, etc., Appellant,
171 vs.
State of Maine.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles L. Hutchinson for the appellant.

Interstate Natural Gas Co., Inc., et al., Appellants,
174 vs.
Abe Arent.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry P. Dart, Jr., and Mr. Henry P. Dart for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. J. D. Barksdale for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

William J. Stratton, as Secretary of State, etc., Appellant,
178 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom and Mr. B. L. Catron for the appellant.

The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company, Appellant,
184 vs.
C. H. Morrissett, State Tax Commissioner, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas B. Gay for the appellant.

Jesus Salvatierra, et al., etc., Appellants,
195 vs.
Independent School District, etc., et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Fred C. Knollenberg for the appellants.

Louis P. Kieldsen,
Appellant,
223 vs.
George C. Barrett, as State Treasurer, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oliver O. Haga for the appellant.

Carolina-Northwestern Railway Company,
Appellant,
250 vs.
F. J. Key.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank G. Tompkins and Mr. J. E. McDonald for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. R. E. Whiting for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

John F. Hanson,
Appellant,
266 vs.
Otto A. Hanson, Individually, etc., et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Hanson, pro se, in support thereof, and by Mr. Frank C. Johnson for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

The Pacific Co., Ltd.,
Appellant,
270 vs.
Charles G. Johnson, State Treasurer of the State of California.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph D. Peeler, Mr. Donald O. Hunter, Mr. Melvin D. Wilson, and Mr. Robert N. Miller for the appellant.

The Atchsion, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, et al.,
Appellants,
287 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick H. Wood, Mr. Walter McFarland, Mr. Elmer A. Smith, Mr. H. H. Larrimore, Mr. J. N. Davis, Mr. A. B. Mason, Mr. R. J. Hagman, Mr. R. S. Outlaw, Mr. Leslie Craven, Mr. Wm. D. Whitney, Mr. A. B. Enoch, and Mr. Frank A. Leffingwell for the appellants.

Southern Railway Company, Appellant,
300 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky;
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, Appellant,
301 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward P. Humphrey, Mr. Charles W. Milner, Mr. L. B. Jeffries, and Mr. S. R. Prince for the appellants.

A. O. Arneson and his wife, Mary Arneson, et al., Appellants,
319 vs.
United Irrigation Company, etc., et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. J. Brooks and Mr. W. L. Matthews for the appellants, in support thereof, and by Mr. W. L. Cook for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company, Appellant,
333 vs.
O. L. Bunn, doing business as Bunn Electric Company, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. Calvin Wells, Mr. Arthur G. Powell, and Mr. Max F. Goldstein for the appellant.

The Texas and Pacific Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
24 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

Four hours were allowed for the argument of this case. Argument was commenced by Mr. Luther M. Walter for the appellants, New Orleans Joint Traffic Bureau, et al.; and continued by Mr. Thomas J. Freeman for the appellants, Texas and Pacific Railway Co., et al.; by Mr. Wylie M. Barrow for the appellant, The State of Louisiana; by Mr. John St. Paul, Jr., for the appellant, The Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans; by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the appellees, The United States and The Interstate Commerce Commission; by Mr. R. S. Outlaw for the appellees, the Missouri-Kansas-Texas R. R. Co., et al.; by Mr. R. C. Fulbright for the appellees, the Galveston Chamber of Commerce, et al.

Proclamation being made the Court is

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore T. Golden, It is ordered that Challen W. Waychoff, Esquire, of Waynesburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. T. W. Gregory, It is ordered that Walter F. Brown, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George O. Compton, It is ordered that Alexander J. Laffey, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mabel Walker Willebrandt, It is ordered that Helen Mary Considine, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Orlin H. Graves, It is ordered that George R. Stuntz, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Titus, It is ordered that Alfred Earle Dennis, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Texas and Pacific Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
24 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. R. C. Fulbright, for the appellees, Galveston Chamber of Commerce, et al.; and concluded by Mr. Luther M. Walter, for the appellants, New Orleans Joint Traffic Bureau, et al.

Louisiana Public Service Commission, etc., et al., Appellants,
36 vs.
The Texas & New Orleans Railroad Company, et al.;
State of Louisiana and Louisiana Public Service Commission, Appellants,
37 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

Three hours were allowed for the oral argument of this cause. Argued by Mr. Wylie M. Barrow for the appellants; by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellees, The United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission; and by Mr. Harry McCall, for the appellees, Texas and New Orleans Railroad Company, et al.

Bandini Petroleum Company, et al., Appellants,
43 vs.
The Superior Court of the State of California, etc., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Robert B. Murphey for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is ad-

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Fisher, It is Ordered that Clyde Gilman Doyle, Esquire, of Long Beach, State of California be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Warren McLaine, It is ordered that G. L. Woodruff, Esquire, of Annapolis, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore T. Golden, It is ordered that Walter C. Montgomery, Esquire, of Waynesburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Drury W. Cooper, It is ordered that Thomas J. Byrne, Esquire, of Bronxville, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Seifert, It is ordered that Arthur B. Van Buskirk, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Kyle, It is ordered that John I. Hook, Esquire, of Waynesburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that John Claremont Lauber, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Kyle, It is ordered that A. A. Purman, Esquire, of Waynesburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Bandini Petroleum Company, et al., Appellants,

43 vs.

The Superior Court of the State of California, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Robert B. Murphey for the appellants, and concluded by Mr. James S. Bennett for the appellees.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, et al., Appellants,

69 vs.

The United States of America, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Frank H. Towner for the appellants; by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellees, the United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission; and by Mr. Robert E. Quirk for the appellee, the South Manchester R. R. Co.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1931 - CONTINUED

Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railway Company, et al.,

Appellants,

vs.

The United States of America, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Leo P. Day for the appellants.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Royal C. Johnson, It is ordered that Tom Kirby, Esquire, of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Albert A. Hoeper,
Appellant,
17 vs.
Tax Commission of Wisconsin, et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. Claire B. Bird for the appellant, and by Mr. John W. Reynolds and Mr. Harold M. Wilkie for the appellees.

Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railway Company, et al.,
Appellants,
1 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Leo P. Day for the appellants, by Mr. J. Stanley Payne for the appellees, The United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission, and concluded by Mr. Leo P. Day for the appellants.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1931 - CONTINUED

The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company, et al.,

Appellants,

2 vs.

Allen J. Maxwell, Commissioner of Revenue of North Carolina.

This case was argued by Mr. John W. Davis for the appellants, and by Mr. Dennis G. Brummitt for the appellee.

The Permutit Company,

Petitioner,

3 vs.

Graver Corporation.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the petitioner and continued by Mr. Charles L. Byron for the respondent.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Rigby, It is ordered that Fred W. Llewellyn, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Wilson, It is ordered that Edward I. Gleszer, Esquire of Banger, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Wilson, It is ordered that Wm. McKinley Gleszer, Esquire, of Hartford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Rigby, It is ordered that James R. Beverley, Esquire, of San Juan, Territory of Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1931 - CONTINUED

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jacob Halper, It is ordered that I. Harry Levin, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Permutit Company,
Petitioner,
3 vs.
Graver Corporation.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Charles L. Byron for the respondent.

The Hardware Dealers Mutual Fire Insurance Co. of Wisconsin,
Appellant,
4 vs.
The Glidden Company, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Mortimer H. Boutelle for the appellant, and by Mr. Homer C. Fulton and Mr. Eugene M. O'Neill for the appellees.

George T. Mitchell, Attorney General of the State of Mississippi, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
5 vs.
Penny Stores, Inc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. Lee Guice for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

De Laval Steam Turbine Company,
Petitioner,
6 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. John Spalding Flannery for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

Cumberland Coal Company, Petitioner,

7 vs.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments, etc.;

Cumberland Coal Company, Petitioner,

8 vs.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments, etc.;

Cumberland Coal Company, Petitioner,

9 vs.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments, etc.;

Cumberland Coal Company, Petitioner,

10 vs.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments, etc.;

Henry A. Phillips, Petitioner,

11 vs.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments, etc.;

Piedmont Coal Company, Petitioner,

12 vs.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments, etc.;

Greene County Coal Company, Petitioner,

13 vs.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments, etc.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Arthur B. Van Buskirk for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is ad

MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John B. Brady, It is ordered that Ezekiel Wolf, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John R. Pendleton, It is ordered that H. C. Ellett, Esquire, of Princeton, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Elizabeth Robinson, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Russell S. Ritz, It is ordered that Grover C. Worrell, Esquire, of Mullens, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rufus W. Pearson, It is ordered that Isidor B. Rosman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins, It is ordered that Joseph Nievinski, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry T. Smith, It is ordered that Alexis T. Gresham, Esquire, of Mobile, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg, It is ordered that Thomas S. Tobin, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced:

In view of the large number of such orders, the orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements, and upon applications for writs of certiorari, as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the Clerk of the Court.

DeForest Radio Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
630, O.T. 1930.
General Electric Company.

It is ordered by the Court that the opinion in this case be amended as follows:

(1) By substituting for the words "In July, 1912," in the 12th line of the last paragraph of the opinion, the following: "August 20, 1912, the earliest date claimed for Langmuir, was rejected, rightly, we think, by the District Court, which held that Langmuir was anticipated by Arnold in November, 1912. But before the earlier date,"

(2) By substituting for the third sentence from the end of the opinion, the following: "By August, 1912, the Telegraph Company used DeForest amplifying audions at 54 volts and by November, they were used by another at 67½ volts. This was possible only because the tubes had thus been exhausted of gas which would otherwise have ionized with blue glow at from 20 to 30 volts."

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—,

In re disbarment of
Harold J. Bandy.

ORDER.

On consideration of the affidavit of Harold J. Bandy in response to the rule of this Court, issued October 12, 1931, to show cause why his name should not be stricken from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice before the bar of this Court,

It is now here ordered that the said rule to show cause be, and it is hereby, discharged.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Wyoming,
Complainant,
15, Original.
vs.
The State of Colorado.

On consideration of the motion to set this case for hearing on the motion to dismiss the bill of complaint,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is assigned for Monday, November 30th next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State of Utah, et al. Petitioners,
42 vs.
The United States of America;
Carbon County Land Company, Petitioner,
48 vs.
The United States of America, ~~et al.~~

It is ordered by the Court that these cases be reassigned for argument on Monday, January 4th next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Hodge Drive-It-Yourself Company, et al., Appellants,
63 vs.
The City of Cincinnati, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Broad-Grace Arcade Corporation, Appellant,
72 vs.
J. Fulmer Bright, Mayor, etc.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. L. Mathews, et al., Appellants,
84 vs.
J. F. Rodgers, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, et al., Appellants,
88 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fox Film Corporation, Appellant,
118 vs.
R. C. Norman, State Tax Commissioner.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Champlin Refining Company, Appellant,
122 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al., etc.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Andrew B. Keating, as Receiver of Taxes, etc., et al., Appellants,

71 vs.

The Public National Bank of New York.

ORDER.

Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court and of the motion to dismiss or affirm is postponed to the hearing of the case on its merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chapel State Theatre Company, Appellant,

77 vs.

Fred W. Hooper, Doing Business as F. W. Hoopur Company.

ORDER.

Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Nellie Field Burwell, Sole Devisee, etc., et al., Appellants,

112 vs.

James T. Powell, et al.

ORDER.

Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph Vallanvanti, Petitioner,

123 vs.

Armour & Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph Vallavanti,
Petitioner,
123 vs.
Armour & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court in and for the County of Middlesex, State of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court in and for the County of Middlesex, State of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Leonard Fernandez,
Petitioner,
126 vs.
Harry M. Kaiser, as Warden of Clinton Prison, Dannemora, N. Y.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Leonard Fernandez,
Petitioner,
126 vs.
Harry M. Kaiser, as Warden of Clinton Prison, Dannemora, N. Y.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the County Court for Clinton County, State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the County Court for Clinton County, State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1931 - CONTINUED

Max Leibowitz and Louis Leibowitz,
Petitioners,
et al.,
144 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Max Leibowitz and Louis Leibowitz,
Petitioners,
144 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cammillus Soleau, et al.,
Petitioners,
166 vs.
Josephine Soleau, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cammillus Soleau and Victor Soleau, an Infant Who Sues by His Next Friend, Henrietta Soleau, Petitioner, vs. Josephine Soleau, Rose Soleau, Ida Cicotte and Adrian Soleau.

166

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ida E. Tutson, Petitioner, vs. Joseph F. Holland, et al.

220

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ida E. Tutson, Petitioner, vs. Joseph F. Holland, Mary E. Holland and William S. Neal.

220

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Glen E. Minnick, Administrator of the Estate of W. H. Minnick, Deceased, Petitioner,

410 vs.

Southern Railway Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Glen E. Minnick, Administrator of the Estate of W. H. Minnick, Deceased, Petitioner,

410 vs.

Southern Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sigmund Ornstein and Louise Ornstein, Appellants,

44 vs.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and on motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel,

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. W. Palm,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

53 vs. State of Oregon.

R. B. Hollopeter.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. W. Palm,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

53 vs. State of Oregon.

R. B. Hollopeter.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sarah P. Stuart and Elizabeth K. Dodge,

Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Judicial Court

56 vs. of the State of Maine.

Charles E. Fox and Edward E. Fox.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sarah P. Stuart and Elizabeth K. Dodge,

Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Judicial Court

of the State of Maine.

56 vs.

Charles E. Fox and Edward E. Fox.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sarah P. Stuart and Elizabeth K. Dodge,

Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Judicial Court

of the State of Maine.

57 vs.

Jessie C. Minott.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sarah P. Stuart and Elizabeth K. Dodge,

Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Judicial Court

of the State of Maine.

57 vs.

Jessie C. Minott.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sarah P. Stuart and Elizabeth K. Dodge,

Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Judicial Court

58 vs. of the State of Maine.

Harry M. Shwartz and Jesse M. Rosenberg.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sarah P. Stuart and Elizabeth K. Dodge,

Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Judicial Court

58 vs. of the State of Maine.

Harry M. Shwartz and Jesse M. Rosenberg.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State of Washington ex rel. George I.
Clithero and 36 Others,

Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

8 0 vs. State of Washington.

N. D. Showalter, etc., et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Walnut and Quincy Streets Corporation,

Appellant,

105 - vs.

William B. Mills, Superintendent of the Department of Public Safety, etc., et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Victor J. Passera, et al.,

Appellants,

136 vs.

Pontchartrain Realty Company, Inc.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Augusta Power Company, a Business Trust;
Hugh C. Middleton, Eugene F. Verdery,
et al., etc.,

Appellants,

89 vs.

Savahnah River Electric Company.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Twin City Power Company,

Appellant,

142 vs.

Savannah River Electric Company.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Twin City Power Company,

Petitioner,

142 vs.

Savannah River Electric Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

L. A. Nixon,

Petitioner,

265 vs.

James Condon and C. H. Kolle.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

L. A. Nixon,
Petitioner,
265 vs.
James Condon and C. H. Kolle.

On consideration of the motion of C. N. Love and others as amici curiae for leave to participate in the oral argument of this case,
It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Herbert S. Daniel, Trustee of Peters Trust Company, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
179 vs.
Guaranty Trust Company of New York.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Baltimore and Philadelphia Steamboat Company and Maryland Casualty Company,
Petitioners,
185 vs.
Augustus P. Horton, Deputy Commissioner for Third Compensation District of United States and Emil Bruno Gube.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harry M. Blackmer, Petitioner,
200 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harry M. Blackmer, Petitioner,
201 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Stevens, Petitioner,
217 vs.
The Vessel "White City," her engines, tackle, apparel, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jesse H. Denton,
Petitioner,

242 vs.

Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company, The Illinois Central Railroad Company, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. George C. Snowden, et al.,
Petitioners,

248 vs.

Red River and Bayou Des Glaises Levee and Drainage District of Louisiana, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Peter H. Miller, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Florida,
Petitioner,

251 vs.

The Standard Nut Margarine Company of Florida.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Josiah T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Georgia,
Petitioner,
252 vs.
The Standard Nut Margarine Company of Florida.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Central Pacific Railway Company and Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioners,
258 vs.
County of Alameda, Chas. W. Meyer, Ralph Richmond, et al., etc.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
263 vs.
Clarence Mezue.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Realty Acceptance Corporation, Petitioner,
314 vs.
Henry C. Montgomery.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Winchester Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
218 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Winchester Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
218 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this cause to the Court of Claims for further findings,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ivan L. Skeen, Petitioner,
173 vs.
Beulah V. Lynch, P. H. Sisney, J. L. Crump, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Eddie Morris,
Petitioner,
175 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hamburg Insurance Company of Hamburg, Germany,
Petitioner,
176 vs.
James A. Beha, Superintendent of Insurance of the State of New York, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Beneficial Loan Society of Bethlehem,
Petitioner,
177 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Faber, Coe & Gregg, Inc.,
Petitioner,
180 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Marblehead Land Company and Standard Oil Company of California,
Petitioners,
181 vs.
City of Los Angeles, A Municipal Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Lotta F. Jacobs, et al.,
Petitioners,
182 vs.
First National Bank of Shreveport, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Minidoka Irrigation District,

Petitioner,

183 vs.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

En-le-te-Ke, Charlie Harjo, Lousanna Harjo and Co-e-see,

Petitioners,

186 vs.

W. A. Beasley, Empire Oil and Refining Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. Aron & Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

187 vs.

Panama Rail Road Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fred E. Turner, Individually, and as the Administrator of the Estate of Julia A. Turner, Deceased and Gunter M. Turner,

Petitioners,

188 vs.

Effie T. Kirkwood.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John W. Jarvis,

Petitioner,

189 vs.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Gypsum Company,

Petitioner,

191 vs.

Plastoid Products, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

City of Corpus Christi, Texas, Petitioner, vs. Corpus Christi Gas Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

192

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. R. A. Hamilton. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

193

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. R. A. Hamilton. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

194

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Claude Neon Southern Corporation, The
E. B. Elliott Co. and Third National
Bank, Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari
196 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
W. T. McCaffrey, as Trustee of Miami of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.
Sign Company, Bankrupt.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
197 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
Shamrock Towing Company, Inc., and of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
Moran Towing & Transportation Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Illinois Power and Light Corporation,
Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
199 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
J. T. Hurley and J. T. Fleishel, of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.
Trustees of Cain-Hurley Lumber Co., etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph H. Hanson, M. D.,

Petitioner,

202 vs.

Michigan State Board of Registration in Medicine.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward DaRoza,

Petitioner,

203 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward DaRoza,

Petitioner,

204 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mito Chemical Corporation,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

205 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sunny Brook Distillery Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

206 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Monorail Company,

Petitioner,

207 vs. On petition for writ of certiorari

A. Stanford Lyon, Judge of the Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri and Vernon B. Shipley. to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

City of Paris, Tennessee,

Petitioner,

208 vs.

Kentucky-Tennessee Light and Power Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John Peter Buren,

Petitioner,

209 vs.

Southern Pacific Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Josie D. Harkins, Joseph D. Harkins, Josephine Browning, et al.,

Petitioners,

210 vs.

Helena M. Johnson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

L. Meisenhelder, as General Administratrix
and Personal Representative of the
Estate of William Thern, Deceased,
Petitioner,
211 vs.
H. E. Byram, Mark W. Potter and
Edward J. Brundage, as Receivers of
the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul
Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Union Trust Company of Rochester, New
York, as Trustee for the Traders
National Bank,
Petitioner,
212 vs.
JamesC. Ayer, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Oregon-Washington Railroad &
Navigation Company,
Petitioner,
213 vs.
Wilbur Bevin, by his Guardian Ad Litem,
R. R. McCarthy.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

C. W. Colgrove and C. W. Colgrove System, Inc., Petitioners,

214 vs.

Leo H. Lowe, Individually and as Director of the Department of Trade and Commerce of the State of Illinois, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Flyer Mfg. Co., Petitioner,

215 vs.

L. Gessford Handy and The Lionel Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James McWilliams Blue Line, Inc., McWilliams Bros., Inc., et al., Petitioners,

216 vs.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Owner of the Steamtug "Brinton," etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr.Chief Justice Hughes.

Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Owner of
the Steamtug " Brinton," etc.,
Petitioner,
244 vs.
James McWilliams Blue Line, Inc.,
McWilliams Bros., Inc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Long Beach-on-the-Ocean, Inc.,
Petitioner,
264 vs.
Pennsylvania Railroad Company, as
Owner of the Steamtug "Brinton."

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Reginald A. Fessenden,
Petitioner,
219 vs.
Richard H. Wilson and John P. Schafer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

G. Bryan Pitts, Petitioner,
vs.
William L. Peak.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

221

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Interstate Transit Company, Petitioner,
vs.
Norman Rogers.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

222

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Artie T. Wells, Petitioner,
vs.
The Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

224

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John S. Phipps,

Petitioner,

225 vs.

Frank C. Bowers, as Executor of the Estate of Frank K. Bowers, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry C. Phipps,

Petitioner,

226 vs.

Frank C. Bowers, as Executor of the Estate of Frank K. Bowers, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Howard Phipps,

Petitioner,

227 vs.

Frank C. Bowers, as Executor of the Estate of Frank K. Bowers, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Helen Martin,

Petitioner,

228 vs.

Frank C. Bowers, as Executor of the Estate of Frank K. Bowers, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arthur Carr,

Petitioner,

229 vs.

W. S. Kingsbury, as Chief of the Division of State Lands, Department of Finance of the State of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeals of the State of California, 4th Appellate District.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, of the State of California, 4th Appellate District, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Roy Maggart,

Petitioner,

230 vs.

W. S. Kingsbury, as Chief of the Division of State Lands, Department of Finance of the State of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal of the State of California, 4th Appellate District.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, of the State of California, 4th Appellate District, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

F. L. Feisthamel,

Petitioner,

231 vs.

W. S. Kingsbury, as Chief of the Division of State Lands, Department of Finance of the State of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, of the State of California, 4th Appellate District.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal of the State of California, 4th Appellate District, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. C. Cumings,

Petitioner,

232 vs.

W. S. Kingsbury, as Chief of the Division of State Lands, Department of Finance of the State of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, of the State of California, 4th Appellate District.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal of the State of California, 4th Appellate District, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thomas A. Joyner,

Petitioner,

233 vs.

W. S. Kingsbury, as Chief of the Division of State Lands, Department of Finance of the State of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, of the State of California, 4th Appellate District.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal of the State of California, 4th Appellate District, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and

Stephen R. Jones, Addison C. Burnham,
Norman W. Bingham, Jr., et al.,
Petitioners,
234 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and Walter O. Woods, Treasurer of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company,
Petitioner,
235 vs.
Lancashire Shipping Company, Ltd.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company,
Petitioner,
236 vs.
Tokio Marine & Fire Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company, Petitioner, vs. Standard Transportation Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

237

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Morse Dry Dock & Repair Company, Petitioner, vs. Standard Oil Company of New York. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

238

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. J. C. Pugh, as Executrix of the Last Will and Testament of J. C. Pugh, Sr., and Mrs. John C. Pugh, Sr., Petitioners, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

239

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

R. E. Allen, Receiver of Public
Sales Corporation,
Petitioner,
240 vs.
A. N. Kelly, Assessor of Yuma County, Arizona, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The People of Porto Rico,
Petitioner,
241 vs.
Clara Livingston.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary Bohenik, Individually and as Administratrix of the Goods, Chattels and Credits Which Were of Tedor Bohenik,
Petitioner,
243 vs.
The Delaware & Hudson Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Anna Beaver Hallam,

Petitioner,

246 vs.

Commerce Mining and Royalty Company, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Subhi Mustafa Sadi,

Petitioner,

247 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Tennessee Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

249 vs.

Cecil Thompson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ed S. Vail Butterine Co.,

Petitioner,

292 vs.

Mabel C. Reinecke, Collector for the First Internal Revenue Collection District of Illinois.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Annie C. Slaughter,

Petitioner,

253 vs.

C. C. Slaughter Company, Henry C. Coke, and J. W. Slaughter, Executors, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for theFifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles E. Havener,

Petitioner,

256 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles E. Havener,
Petitioner,
256 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

E. C. Riegel,
Petitioner,
257 vs.
The Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Paul Graffe,
Petitioner,
259 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Maryland Casualty Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 260

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Unaka and City National Bank, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 261

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fort Worth Independent School District, Petitioner, vs. Aetna Casualty & Surety Company. 262

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Life & Casualty Insurance Company
of Tennessee,
Petitioner,
267 vs.
Cuba Heathcott, by next friend.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Life & Casualty Insurance Company
of Tennessee,
Petitioner,
268 vs.
Cuba Heathcott, by next friend.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sidney Z. Mitchell,
Petitioner,
269 vs.
The Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. B. Davis, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 271

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Merritt J. Corbett, Petitioner, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. 272

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cleveland-Cliffs Steamship Company, Petitioner, vs. Cargill Grain Company. 273

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph A. Diamond and Esther A. Diamond, Petitioners, vs. New York Life Insurance Company.

274

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frommel Realty and Investment Co., Harry Ferguson, Louis Ferguson, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

275

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United Drug Company, Appellant, vs. Frank J. Washburn, Commissioner of Agriculture, etc.

324

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Brenton H. Fisk for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Nathan W. Thompson for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

John W. Keogh,
Appellant,
371 vs.
Robert E. Neely, Acting United States Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Keogh, pro se, in support thereof, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

John T. Stone,
Petitioner,
308 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel R. Rothemel and Mr. Edward O. Proctor for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the respondent.

William A. Patterson, Albert E. Rust, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
309 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward O. Proctor and Mr. Daniel R. Rothermel for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.

Louis Horkheimer and Julius Horkheimer,
Petitioners,
310 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward O. Proctor and Mr. Daniel R. Rothermel for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.

John W. Keogh,
Petitioner,
371 vs.
Robert E. Neely, Acting United States Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Keogh, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Hayner H. Larson for the respondent.

Harry Blockburger,
Petitioner,
374 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold J. Bandy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.

Jos. Denunzio Fruit Company,
Petitioner,
381 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore B. Benson, Mr. Frank S. Bright, and Mr. H. Stanley Kimmichs for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. E. Lee Hamson for the respondent.

William M. Taylor, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
389 vs.
Mary Plomondon Jones, Bankrupt.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elmer J. Lundy for the petitioner.

R. E. Kennington, Liquidator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
390 vs.
C. L. Donald, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry J. Richardson, Mr. Garner W. Green, Mr. W. H. Watkins, and Mr. Marcellus Green for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Wm. Cutler Thompson, and Mr. Wm. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

James Dunn, Petitioner,
393 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond T. Coughlin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Wirt Franklin, Petitioner,
394 vs.
Frank Carter, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. M. Rainey and Mr. Streeter B. Flynn for the petitioner.

Chicago Fraternal Life Association, Petitioner,
395 vs.
Emily H. Karst.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Springfield Court of Appeals, State of Missouri, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Corrigan for the petitioner.

F. M. Hubbell Son & Company,
Petitioner,
400 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. G. Gamble for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. A. H. Conner for the respondent.

American Surety Company of New York,
Petitioner,
401 vs.
The Greek Catholic Union.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Magee for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas Stephen Brown and Mr. Ralph C. Davis for the respondent.

The Archibald McNeil & Sons Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
402 vs.
Western Maryland Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Demming, Mr. John R. Geyer, and Mr. Paul C. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alexander Armstrong for the respondent.

Charley Singleton, et al.,
Petitioners,
403 vs.
Edith Cheek, nee Jackson, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. G. C. Beirer for the petitioners.

United States ex rel. Arthur J. Klein, Petitioner,

404 vs.

Raymond J. Mulligan, Acting United States Marshal.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the Court by Mr. D. Basil O'Connor for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert D. Murray for the respondent.

Kotex, Inc., Edward Bernstein, et al., Petitioners,

412 vs.

Kotex Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin S. Kirsh for the petitioners, and Cola G. Parker for the respondent.

The Aetna Casualty and Surety Company, Petitioner,

413 vs.

Phoenix National Bank and Trust Company of Lexington.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Kerr, Mr. Clinton M. Harbison, Mr. Samuel M. Wilson, and Mr. A. K. Skipe for the petitioner, and by Mr. Richard C. Stoll for the respondent.

Charles F. Holbridge, Charles Frederick Coots, et al., Petitioners,

415 vs.

Arthur J. Oldfield, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Orla B. Taylor for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frederick C. Kurth and Mr. Howard F. Cline for the respondents.

Milmine Bodman & Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
418 vs.
Empire Canal Corporation, et al.;
Norris Grain Company of New York, Inc.,
Petitioner,
419 vs.
Empire Canal Corporation, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George V. A. McCloskey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mark W. Maclay and Mr. John Tilney Carpenter for the respondents.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
426 vs.
Charles P. Leininger.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Levi Cooke and Mr. George R. Beneman for the respondent.

Cumberland Coal Company, Petitioner,
7 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments, etc.;

Cumberland Coal Company, Petitioner,
8 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments, etc.;

Cumberland Coal Company, Petitioner,
9 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments, etc.;

Cumberland Coal Company, Petitioner,
10 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments, etc.;

Henry A. Phillips, Petitioner,
11 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments, etc.;

Piedmont Coal Company, Petitioner,
12 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments, etc.;

Greene County Coal Company, Petitioner,
13 vs.
Board of Revision of Tax Assessments, etc.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Arthur B. Van Buskirk for the petitioners, and concluded by Mr. Challen W. Waychoff for the respondent.

Handy and Harman,

Petitioner,

14 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

This case was argued by Mr. William C. Breed for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.

Iowa-Des Moines National Bank, Petitioner,

15 vs.

E. R. Bennett, Chairman, etc.;

Central State Bank, Petitioner,

16 vs.

E. R. Bennett, Chairman, etc.

Three hours allowed for the oral argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. J. G. Gamble for the petitioners.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph E. Updike, It is ordered that Anne B. Leach, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Iowa-Des Moines National Bank, Petitioner,
15 vs.
E. R. Bennett, Chairman, etc.;
Central State Bank, Petitioner,
16 vs.
E. R. Bennett, Chairman, etc.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. J. C. Gamble for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles Hutchinson and Mr. Eskie C. Carlson for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. A. B. Howland for the petitioner.

David W. Phillips, Collector of Internal Revenue,
18 vs.
Dime Trust & Safe Deposit Company,

This case was argued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for Phillips, Collector, and by Mr. Charles C. Lark for the Dime Trust & Safe Deposit Company.

Letus N. Crowell, as Deputy Commissioner, etc., et al., Petitioners,
19 vs.
Charles Benson;
Letus N. Crowell, as Deputy Commissioner, etc., et al., Petitioners,
20 vs.
Charles Benson.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for petitioner, Letus N. Crowell, as Deputy Commissioner; continued by Mr. Alexis T. Gresham for petitioner, J. B. Knudson; and by Mr. Harry T. Smith for the respondent.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1931.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert P. Beyer, It is ordered that Charles A. Schneider, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Short, It is ordered that T. Austin Gavin, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ross H. Snyder, It is ordered that Alexander K. Hancock, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Israel M. Foster, It is ordered that Joseph W. Horner, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Short, It is ordered that Roy F. Ford, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States,
Petitioner,
26 vs.
Kirby Lumber Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Robert Ash, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of American Tobacco Company as amicus curiae in this cause.

Letus N. Crowell, as Deputy Commissioner, etc., et al., Petitioner,
19 vs.
Charles Benson;
Letus N. Crowell, as Deputy Commissioner, etc., et al., Petitioners,
20 vs.
Charles Benson.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Harry T. Smith for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, Letus N. Crowell, as Deputy Commissioner.

The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner,
21 vs.
Boyd E. Chambers;
The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner,
22 vs.
E. L. Fitzgerald;
The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner,
23 vs.
W. O. Hylton.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. John R. Pendleton for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Russell S. Ritz for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Grover C. Worrell for the respondent.

City of Chicago, Appellant, 25 vs. Chicago Rapid Transit Company.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Albert H. Veeder for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Joseph F. Grossman for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.
The United States, Petitioner, 26 vs. Kirby Lumber Company.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Robert Ash for the respondent.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David F. Anderson, It is ordered that Homer H. Marshman, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Thomas J. Mangan, Esquire, of Binghamton, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that Essex S. Abbott, Esquire, of Haverhill, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that David J. Goddaire, Esquire, of Haverhill, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carroll C. Walter, It is ordered that Ralph Atkins, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John F. McCarron, It is ordered that Henry T. Bannon, Esquire, of Portsmouth, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Wm. H. Moore, Jr., Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc., Petitioner,
27 vs.
O. S. Bay.

This case was argued by Mr. Thomas S. Tobin for the petitioner. No appearance for the respondent.

Sun Insurance Office, Petitioner,
28 vs.
J. M. Scott;
Norwich Union Fire Insurance Society, Ltd., Petitioner,
29 vs.
J. M. Scott;
The Home Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner,
30 vs.
J. M. Scott.

These cases were argued by Mr. Rolland M. Edmonds for the petitioners, and by Mr. F. S. Monnett for the respondent.

Magno Santovincenzo, Consul of the Kingdom of Italy at New York, Appellant,
31 vs.
James F. Egan, Public Administrator, etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Carroll C. Walter for the appellant, and by Mr. Robert P. Beyer for the appellee.

William H. Mecon, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Roy F. Ford for the petitioner,
32 vs.	and continued by Mr. T. Austin Gavin
Fitzsimmons Drilling Co., Inc., et al.	for the respondent.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Fisher, It is ordered that Elwood Anderson, Esquire, of Gillette, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Schwertner, It is ordered that Wm. J. P. Aberg, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

City of Willow Glen,
Petitioner,
336 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

The motion for leave to file brief of the City of Los Angeles, City of San Francisco, City of Oakland, and others as amici curiae was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney in that behalf, with leave until Monday next to secure consent of counsel to the filing of the brief.

Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
45 vs.
R. R. Moore, as Administrator, etc.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. Frank G. Tompkins, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the petitioner, and by Mr. William C. Wolfe for the respondent.

William H. Mecon, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
32 vs.
Fitzsimmons Drilling Co., Inc., et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. T. Austin Gavin and Mr. George F. Short for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Roy F. Ford for the petitioner.

The United States of America,
Interstate Commerce Commission, et al., Appellants,
33 vs.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. Stanley Payne for appellants, The United States and The Interstate Commerce Commission; continued by Mr. Parker McCollester for appellant, Hoboken Manufacturer's R. R. Co.; by Mr. Henry S. Drinker, Jr., for the appellees; and concluded by Mr. Parker McCollester for appellant, Hoboken Manufacturer's R. R. Co.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
34 vs.
William Kuhn;
The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner,
35 vs.
William Kuhn.

These cases were argued by Mr. Henry Bannon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Homer H. Marshman for the respondent.

The United States of America, Appellant,
38 vs.
Harry Murdock.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the appellant.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
~~Oliver Wendell Holmes~~,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel A. Syme, It is ordered that M. Lewis Hall, Esquire, of Ft. Lauderdale, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elliott C. Lovett, It is ordered that Henry T. Golightly, Esquire, of Fairburn, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer Thomas, It is ordered that R. M. Mountcastle, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ash, It is ordered that Geo. E. H. Goodner, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Seth W. Richardson, It is ordered that Leno Fritz, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. H. Hoppe, It is ordered that Alonzo M. Snyder, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas F. Cameron, It is ordered that William T. Howley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Walsh, It is ordered that George D. Toole, Esquire, of Butte, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railway Company, The Ann Arbor Railroad Company, The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America and The Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Great Atlantic & Pacific
Tea Company, et al.,
Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the
2 vs. State of North Carolina.
Allen J. Maxwell, Commissioner of
Revenue of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Concurring: Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice Sutherland.
Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds and Mr. Justice Butler.

George T. Mitchell, Attorney General of
the State of Mississippi; L. C. Franklin,
H. H. Casteel, et al., etc., et al., Appeal from the District Court of the
Appellants, United States for the Southern
5 vs. District of Mississippi.
Penny Stores, Incorporated.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court granting an interlocutory injunction in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Boyd E. Chambers. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

21

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. E. L. Fitzgerald. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

22

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Virginian Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. W. O. Hylton. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

23

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

City of Chicago, Appellant, vs. Chicago Rapid Transit Company. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

25

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Public Service Commission of Indiana, et al., Appellants, vs. Batesville Telephone Company. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

120

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Samuel W. Baxter, as Administrator of the Estate of George A. Zeller, Deceased, Appellant,
68 vs.
Continental Casualty Company.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced:

In view of the large number of such orders, the other orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements, and upon applications for writs of certiorari, as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the clerk of the Court.

William J. Stratton, as Secretary of State of the State of Illinois, Appellant,
178 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, November 30, next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
287 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. The motion to advance is granted and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, November 30, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway Company, Appellant, 300 vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky; Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, Appellant, 301 vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky.	In these cases probable jurisdiction is noted. The motion to advance is granted and the cases are advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, November 30, next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
Amos Shriver, Appellant, 158 vs. Woodbine Savings Bank of Woodbine, Iowa.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
A. H. Averill, as Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon, Appellant, 165 vs. Northwestern National Insurance Company of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
First National Bank of Boston, Executor, etc., Appellant, 171 vs. State of Maine.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
The Pacific Co., Ltd., Appellant, 270 vs. Charles G. Johnson, State Treasurer of California.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
Yale Oil Corporation of South Dakota, Appellant, 159 vs. The State of Montana.	Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gregg Dyeing Company, Appellant, vs. W. G. Query, et al., etc.	Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
170	
The City of Greenville, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. W. G. Query, et al., etc.	Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
245	
Carolina-Northwestern Railway Company, Appellant, vs. F. J. Key.	Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
250	
A. O. Arneson, and his wife, Mary Arneson, et al., Appellants, vs. United Irrigation Company, etc., et al.	Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
319	
Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company, Appellant, vs. O. L. Bunn, doing business as Bunn Electric Company, et al.	Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
333	

L. S. Brannan, M. N. Carroll,
D. O. Hamby, et al.,
Appellants,
169 vs.
William B. Harrison, as Comptroller
General and Ex-Officio Insurance
Commissioner.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Interstate Natural Gas Co., Inc., The
Texas Company, Samuel D. Hunter,
and William B. McCormick,
Appellants,
174 vs.
Abe Arent.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Interstate Natural Gas Co., Inc., The Texas Company, Samuel D. Hunter, and William B. McCormick, Appellants, vs. Abe Arent. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

174

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jesus Salvatierra, Alonzo Cadena, Pedro Dias, et al., etc., Appellants, vs. Independent School District Known as The Inhabitants of the Town of Del Rio, et al. — Appeal from the Court of Civil Appeals of the State of Texas, Fourth Supreme Judicial District.

195

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals of the State of Texas, Fourth Supreme Judicial District, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jesus Salvatierra, Alonzo Cadena, Pedro Dias, et al., etc., Appellants, vs. Independent School District Known as The Inhabitants of the Town of Del Rio, et al. — Appeal from the Court of Civil Appeals of the State of Texas, Fourth Supreme Judicial District.

195

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Court of Civil Appeals of the State of Texas, Fourth Supreme Judicial District, as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Louis P. Kieldsen,

Appellant,

223 vs.

George C. Barrett, as State Treasurer of the State of Idaho.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John F. Hanson, Appellant,

266 vs.

Otto A. Hanson, Individually and as Executor of the Estate of Lisa Hanson, Deceased, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John F. Hanson, Appellant,

266 vs.

Otto A. Hanson, Individually, etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Lias, Joe Fragale and Theodore Prosos, Petitioners,
328 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted, limited to the question raised by the supplemental charge to the jury. The case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, November 23rd next at the head of the call for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. ChiefJustice Hughes.

Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,
291 vs.
Mack Saxon, Ancillary Administrator and personal representative in Texas of the Estate of J. W. Moore, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Navigation Company, Inc., Petitioner,
296 vs.
The Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd., et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Iris Christine Bergholm, et al., Petitioners,
297 vs.
Peoria Life Insurance Company of Peoria, Illinois.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company, Petitioner,
311 vs.
Sophia C. Bachmann.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. Howard Leman, Administrator C. T. A. of the Estate of George E. Belcher, and George E. Belcher Company, Petitioners,
332 vs.
Krentler-Arnold Hinge Last Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
341 vs.
Coronado Oil and Gas Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Old Colony Railroad Company, Petitioner,
349 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank Collis Bowers, as Executor of the Estate of Frank K. Bowers, Formerly United States Collector, etc., Petitioner,
355 vs.
Lawyers Mortgage Company.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
356 vs.
Home Title Insurance Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
365 vs.
Sophia David, Administratrix of the Estate of James Lee David, Deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
378 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Canal Steel Works, Inc.,
Petitioner,
276 vs.
One Drag Line Dredge.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Company of California,
Petitioner,
277 vs.
Wanda Roberta Barton, et al., Minors, by Quinn R. Barton, Their Next Friend, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary A. Lineberry,
Petitioner,
278 vs.
Woodward & Lothrop.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Willie E. Lineberry,
Petitioner,
279 vs.
Woodward & Lothrop.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph Engelsberg,
Petitioner,
280 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Benjamin Gitlow, as President of "Revolutionary Age," etc.,
Petitioner,
281 vs.
John J. Kiely, Postmaster of the City of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Norman S. Bowles, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 282

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. C. Ray and W. M. Davidson, Petitioners, vs. Silver Springs Paradise Company. 283

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Otto F. Gluck, Petitioner, vs. Lillian Kemper. 284

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the said is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chemical Foundation, Inc.,
Petitioner,
285 vs.
General Electric Company and Victor X-Ray Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dow V. Walker and August Wemme,
Petitioners,
288 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States of America and John R. Latourette.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Basil Robillard, as Executor of the Estate of Martha H. Beeman, Deceased,
Petitioner,
289 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Cirruit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. D. Burrowes, Receiver of the First National Bank of Dunn, N. C.,

Petitioner,

290 vs.

Bertha Goodman, Executrix under the Will of Harry Goodman, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sallie M. Wise,

Petitioner,

295 vs.

W. L. Miller, David J. Davis and Birmingham Trust and Savings Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Wadsworth Electric Manufacturing Company,

Petitioner,

298 vs.

The Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Enrique Monserrat,
Petitioner,
vs.
Alfredo Carmelo and Ramon Oriol.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

299

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Georgios or George Fafalios,
Petitioner,
vs.
William N. Doak, Secretary of Labor.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

302

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles B. Stratton, et al., Executors,
Petitioners,
vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

303

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lamont Miller, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 304

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Clinton Hoffman, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 305

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Warren and Arthur Smadbeck, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Heling Contracting Corporation. 306

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Herman M. Diamond, Petitioner, vs. John J. McMahon. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Errors and Appeals, State of New Jersey.

307

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Errors and Appeals, State of New Jersey, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bessie D. Laughlin, Administratrix of the Estate of Elmyr A. Laughlin, deceased, Petitioner, vs. Thomas E. Robertson, Commissioner of Patents. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

312

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George M. Wright and William A. Morehead, Petitioners, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

313

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner, vs. Wilton McCarthy. 315

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Heyman Rosenberg and Parker-Kalon Corporation, Petitioners, vs. Carr Fastner Company. 316

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Indemnity Insurance Company of North America, H. E. Vogel, W. H. Say, et al., Petitioners, vs. N. L. Levering. 317

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Leoncio C. Belisario,
Petitioner,
318 vs.
The People of the Philippine Islands.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jonathan Godfrey,
Petitioner,
322 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Estate of Charles G. Waldo, Deceased,
Petitioner,
323 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary E. Hanlon,

Petitioner,

326 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Elizabeth Henaghan,

Petitioner,

327 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Phil Collenger,

Petitioner,

329 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John Antonean,
Petitioner,
330 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Manuel V. Domenech, Treasurer of Porto Rico,
Petitioner,
331 vs.
Porto Rican Leaf Tobacco Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Spring Canyon Coal Company,
Petitioner,
334 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Spring Canyon Coal Company,

Petitioner,

335 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

National Tank Seal Company,

Petitioner,

342 vs.

Johns-Manville Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The North American Coal Corporation,

Petitioner,

343 vs.

The Wheeling and Lake Erie Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mari Tollefsen Todok and Knut C. Engen,

Petitioners,

344 vs.

Union State Bank of Harvard, Harvard, Nebraska, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraka, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Benjamin L. Allen,

Petitioner,

345 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Buick Motor Company,

Petitioner,

346 vs.

City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin and John L. Drew, Treasurer of the City of Milwaukee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty
Company,
Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
247 vs. to the Supreme Court of the
State of Kansas at the Relation and State of Missouri.
to the Use of the Winkle Terra Cotta
Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Amante Roungetti, On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioner, to the Supreme Court of the
350 vs. State of Illinois.
The State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

S. P. Knut, Individually and as Administrator
of the Estate of Haller Nutt, Sr.,
deceased, et al., Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari
351 vs. to the Supreme Court of the
Patrick Henry, Executor of Haller Nutt, State of Mississippi.
Jr., deceased, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

S. P. Knut, Individually and as Administrator of the Estate of Haller Nutt, Sr., deceased, et al., Petitioners, vs. Elizabeth N. Forsyth, et al.

352 On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

August J. Schick, Petitioner, vs. City of New Orleans, et al.

353 On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William N. Leland, et al., Petitioners, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

354 On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louis B. Bubank, Thomas H. Naylor, John Malott Fletcher, Trustees under the Will of Volney T. Malott, deceased, Petitioners,

359 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Kathryn T. Long, Petitioner,

360 vs.

Frederick H. Rike, Individually and as Trustee under the Last Will and Testament of Joseph B. Long, deceased, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Nicola Ranieri, petitioner,

361 vs.

S. D. Smith, District Director in Charge of Immigration at Chicago, Illinois, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Seaboard Oil Company,
Petitioner,
362 vs.
Fred B. Cunningham.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

R. V. Board,
Petitioner,
363 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Niels (Mellie) Esperson Stewart
Executrix of the Estate of Niels
Esperson, deceased,
Petitioner,
366 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Niels (Mellie) Esperson,

Petitioner,

367 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Niels (Mellie) Esperson, Executrix of the Estate of Niels Esperson, deceased,

Petitioner,

368 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, as Agent, etc.,

Petitioner,

369 vs.

China Fire Insurance Company, Ltd., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Lamson Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

370 vs.

H. H. Whittemore, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Gelino's Inc., a bankrupt.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Geronimo Ramirez,

Petitioner,

373 vs.

The State of Texas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Criminal Appeals, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Criminal Appeals, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

South Florida Lumber Mills,

Petitioner,

392 vs.

Jules Breuchaud.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

D. T. Blodgett, as Taxpayer in behalf of other taxpayers and himself, Petitioner,

vs.

Wm. D. Dehy, William H. Waste, John W. Shenk, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court for the County of Santa Barbara, State of California.

399

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court for the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Courtney Taylor, et al., Petitioners,

vs.

American Liability Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

198

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chase National Bank of the City of New York, Petitioner,

vs.

City of Sanford, Florida.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

364

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George Davidson, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

375

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George M. Phillips, Petitioner, vs. Union Terminal Railway Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

376

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles E. Forsythe and James A. Forsythe, Co-partners doing business as Forsythe Brothers, Owners of the coal hoister "Gold Digger," Petitioners, vs. James Tregarthen & Sons Co. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

377

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Taylor-Moore Syndicate, Inc., a Florida Corporation, et al., Petitioners, vs. Central Florida Lumber Company. 379 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Florence C. Knollenberg, Petitioner, vs. The State Bank of Alamogordo. 380 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. Schrader's Son, Inc., Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 382 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Petitioner,
383 vs.
Tom Hall.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. Bernard Vause, Petitioner,
384 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Samuel Schuchman, Petitioner,
386 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. P. Allen, Petitioner, vs. Citizens Bank & Trust Company. 385

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Monarch Tool & Manufacturing Company, Petitioner, vs. Mills Novelty Company. 388

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bradley A. Fiske, Petitioner, vs. William A. Moffett. 396

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

397 vs.

Mamie Lee Derrington, Administratrix of the Estate of Arch Derrington, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago & North Western Railway Company,

Petitioner,

417 vs.

George G. Struthers, as Special Administrator of the Estate of Eugene F. Curran, deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following order:

ORDER.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, November 2, to Monday, November 23, next.

John Strong,

Petitioner,

39 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts entered on June 27, 1930, and the judgment of the said Circuit Court of Appeals entered in this cause on January 5, 1931, be vacated, and that the cause be remanded to the said District Court with instructions to enter a decree dismissing the libel and ordering that the liquors in question be returned to the claimant;

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, and on motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the decree of the said District Court and the judgment of the said Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same are hereby, vacated; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts with instructions to enter a decree dismissing the libel and ordering the liquors in question to be returned to the claimant.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

City of Willow Glen,

Petitioner,

336 vs.

Southern Pacific Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a brief of the City of Los Angeles and others as amici curiae, It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners,
130 vs.
Ben Terte, Judge, etc.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Elliott in behalf of counsel for the respondent.

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company, a Corporation, E. P. Magill, et al., Petitioners,
372 vs.
Enoch Howell, Administrator of the Estate of P. P. Paris, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that a stipulation of counsel to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed.

Therefore, in pursuance of said stipulation, it is now here ordered that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mannie Lee King, Petitioner,
476 vs.
Mrs. Sarah Peterson, et al.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mannie Lee King pro se.

T. Irving Potter and C. E. Bahr, Appellants,
325 vs.
Charles R. Maybury, as Director, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred J. Schweppe for the appellants.

Dahlstrom Metallic Door Company, et al., Appellants,
338 vs.
Industrial Board of the State of New York.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Jackson for the appellants.

T. Binford, et al., Appellants,
391 vs.
J. H. McLeaish & Company, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert L. Reed and Mr. ~~Albert C. Hooper~~ for the appellants.

United Cigar Stores Company of America, Petitioner,
340 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sol M. Stroock, Mr. Charles C. Carlin, Mr. M. Carter Hall, and Mr. Edward F. Spitz for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General [illegible], Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. Joseph H. Sheppard for the respondent.

The Darby-Lynde Company, Petitioner,
398 vs.
Acel C. Alexander, Collector of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. E. Swan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Miss Helen R. Carloss, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

John B. Ford, Petitioner,
405 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
George Ross Ford, Petitioner,
406 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
Mrs. Edna F. Knight, Petitioner,
407 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
Mrs. Mary Ford Bacon, Petitioner,
408 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
Mrs. Carrie J. Ford, Petitioner,

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Levi Cooke, Mr. Mark Eisner, and Mr. Ferdinand Tannenbaum for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. A. H. Conner, Mr. J. P. Jackson, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

The Galveston Wharf Company, et al., Petitioners,
411 vs.
The Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Ry. Co., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alex F. Weisberg and Mr. George S. Wright for the petitioner.

Tomas Acevedo, Petitioner,
414 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benicio F. Sanchez for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The Portage Silica Company, Petitioner,
416 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Dawley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

United States ex rel. Th. Goldschmidt, A. G., Petitioner,
420 vs.
Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Spier Whitaker, Mr. Lawrence A. Baker, and Mr. Henry Ravenel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General St. Lewis, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Henry A. Cox, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondents.

Irving Trust Company, Receiver,
Petitioner,
421 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Gale for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Norman D. Keller for the respondent.

Dan Hogan, et al.,
Petitioners,
422 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin C. Hollins for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. A. W. Henderson, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Greater New York Development Company,
Petitioner,
424 vs.
Annie L. Sears, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Phillips Ketchum for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. H. Nash for the respondent.

Walter Schaefer,
Petitioner,
425 vs.
Frank Collis Bowers, Executor, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis and Mr. Marion M. Fisher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. A. H. Conner for the respondent.

W. H. Colquitt, Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
428 vs.
Roxana Petroleum Corporation, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. W. Gregory for the petitioner.

D. Ginsberg & Sons, Inc., Petitioner,
429 vs.
Joseph Popkin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Raymond J. Mawhinney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Jersawit for the respondent.

William E. Lamb, Petitioner,
432 vs.
Sterling B. Cramer, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arvid B. Tanner, Mr. W. Calvin Wells, and Mr. Emile Godchaux for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gerald FitzGerald for the respondent.

William E. Lamb, Petitioner,
433 vs.
William A. Schmitt, Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arvid B. Tanner, Mr. W. Calvin Wells, and Mr. Emile Godchaux for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gerald FitzGerald for the respondent.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
435 vs.
Highway Engineering & Construction Company, Inc.;
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
436 vs.
Highway Engineering & Construction Company, Inc.;
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
437 vs.
Highway Engineering & Construction Company, Inc.;
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
438 vs.
Highway Engineering & Construction Company, Inc.;
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
439 vs.
Highway Engineering & Construction Company, Inc.;
United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner,
440 vs.
Highway Engineering & Construction Company, Inc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Davis, Mr. Lucien H. Boggs, Mr. Herbert S. Phillips, and Mr. J. Kemp Bartlett for the petitioners, and by Mr. George C. Bedell and Mr. A. G. Turner for the respondents.

General Motors Corporation, et al., Petitioners,
442 vs.
Motor Improvements, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Drury W. Cooper and Mr. Allan C. Rasewell for the petitioners, and by Mr. Wm. Houston Kenyon, Mr. W. W. Miller, Mr. Theodore S. Kenyon, and Mr. Nelson Littell for the respondents.

George Harvey,
Petitioner,
443 vs.
American Coal Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sol M. Ezary for the petitioner and by Mr. E. L. Greever for the respondents.

Irving Trust Company, as Permanent Receiver, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
445 vs.
Olivier Straw Goods Corporation, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Moses Cohen for the petitioners, and by Mr. Selden Bacon and John W. Crandall for the respondents.

Boston and Maine Railroad,
Petitioner,
477 vs.
Fred Armburg.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Municipal Court of the City of Boston, County of Suffolk, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip M. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clarence W. Kelley for the respondent.

Ralph J. Capone,
Petitioner,
479 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Murdock and Mr. Dennis M. Kelleher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Green Star Steamship Co., Ltd., Petitioner,
64 vs.
Armour & Company, et al.

This case was continued per stipulation of counsel.

The United States of America, Appellant,
38 vs.
Harry Murdock.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the appellant, by Mr. Harold J. Bandy and Mr. Edmund Burke for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the appellant.

State Tax Commission of Mississippi, et al., Appellants,
40 vs.
Interstate Natural Gas Company, Inc.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. David C. Bramlett that leave be given Mr. Edwin R. Holmes, Jr., to appear and present oral argument for the appellants in this cause pro hac vice,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State Tax Commission of Mississippi, et al., etc., Appellants,
40 vs.
Interstate Natural Gas Company, Inc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Edwin R. Holmes, Jr., for the appellant, pro hac vice, by special leave of Court, and continued by Mr. David Clay Bramlett for the appellee. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Painters District Council No. 14, of Chicago, etc., et al., Appellants,
41 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. William E. Rodriguez for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellee.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
49 vs.
Edward Ryan, Claimant of One Brunswick Bar.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vincent Carter, It is ordered that Irving Goff McCann, Esquire, of Casper, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
49 vs.
Edward Ryan, Claimant of One Brunswick Bar.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. George D. Toole for the respondent.

Western Pacific California Railroad Company, Petitioner,
51 vs.
Southern Pacific Company.

This case was argued by Mr. F. M. Angellotti for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. R. Bell for the respondent.

Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
52 vs.
Edward Walters, a Minor, by Herman Walters, his father and next friend.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Bruce A. Campbell for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Charles A. Lich for the respondent.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Luther A. Johnson, It is ordered that Cecil Clifford Rotsch, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Southern Railway Company, Petitioner,
52 vs.
Edward Walters, a minor, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Charles A. Lich for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Bruce A. Campbell for the petitioner.

I. J. Van Huffel, Petitioner,
54 vs.
Trace D. Harkelrode, Treasurer, etc.;
I. J. Van Huffel, Petitioner,
55 vs.
Trace D. Harkelrode, Treasurer, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. H. H. Hoppe for the petitioner, continued by Mr. C. H. Birrell and Mr. Gilbert Bettman for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Alonzo M. Snyder for the petitioner.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
59 vs.
Frank B. Campbell.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General St. Lewis for the petitioner, and the case was submitted by Mr. David T. Lee for the respondent.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Petitioner,
60 vs.
Eugene Bolle.

This case was argued by Mr. Samuel H. Cady for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph D. Ryan for the respondent.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
66 vs.
The United States of America ex rel.
The Vindicator Consolidated Gold Mining Company;
Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
67 vs.
The United States of America ex rel.
Chestatee Pyrites & Chemical Corporation.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Seth W. Richardson, It is ordered that Arthur H. Schwartz, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Philip Hill, It is ordered that Louis A. Gravelle, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ellsworth C. Alvord, It is ordered that Eugene F. Bogan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lindley H. Hadley, It is ordered that Clarence T. Arai, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Norman S. Bowles, Petitioner,
282 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion of counsel for the petitioner to withhold the issuance of the order denying a petition for writ of certiorari in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Champlin Refining Company, Appellant,
122 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to pass this case to follow No. 485, Champlin Refining Company vs. Corporation Commission, etc., and No. 486, Corporation Commission, etc., vs. Champlin Refining Co.,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
66 vs.
The United States of America, ex rel. The Vindicator Consolidated Gold Mining Company;
Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,
67 vs.
The United States of America, ex rel. Chestatee Pyrites & Chemical Corporation.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the petitioner, by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson for the petitioner.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic P. Lee, It is ordered that Alice Greenacre, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy St. Lewis, It is ordered that Clarence Lohman, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy St. Lewis, It is ordered that Ralph A. Warney, Esquire, of Pawhuska, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elliot C. Lovett, It is ordered that Carroll E. Wright, Esquire, of Logan, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eliot C. Lovett, It is ordered that Forest E. Weinrich, Esquire, of Logan, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Craig Peacock, It is ordered that Frank A. Mathews, Jr., Esquire, of Palmyra, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John C. Kramer, It is ordered that Arthur J. Thomas, Esquire, of Salisbury, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eliot C. Lovett, It is ordered that Chas. Wood Bowen, Esquire, of Logan, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The United States,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

26 vs. Court of Claims,

Kirby Lumber Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Wm. H. Moore, Jr., Trustee in Bankruptcy for the Estate of Sassard & Kimball, Inc., Bankrupt, Petitioner, vs. O. S. Bay. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

27

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Southern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. R. R. Moore, as Administrator of the Estate of Edwin A. Wagnon, Deceased. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

45

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina for further proceedings not inconsostent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Painters District Council No. 14 of Chicago
and Vicinity of the Brotherhood of
Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers
of America, et al.,
Appellants,
41 vs.
The United States of America.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
59 vs.
Frank B. Campbell.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John W. Keogh,

Appellant,

371 vs.

Robert Neely, Acting United States Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John W. Keogh,

Petitioner,

371 vs.

Robert E. Neely, Acting United States Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced:

In view of the large number of such orders, the other orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements and upon applications for writs of certiorari as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the clerk of the Court.

—

In re: disbarment of William E. Baff.

A rule having been issued by this Court on March 25, 1931, directing William E. Baff to show cause why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court upon the ground that he had been disbarred in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California; the rule, together with the return and answer of the said Baff thereto, having been referred to a Committee of the Bar of this Court to make report and recommendation respecting the final action to be taken by this Court conformably to Rule 2, paragraph 5 of the Rules of this Court; the said Committee having reported that the evidence does not warrant the conclusion that the disbarment of the said Baff by the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California was disciplinary but rather because his name had been entered upon the rolls of the court without a proper showing of qualification; and the majority of said Committee having recommended that the rule to show cause heretofore issued against the said Baff be discharged on the ground that no charges had been made which would constitute a ground for his disbarment by this Court upon paragraph 5 of Rule 2,

It is ordered that the rule to show cause issued against the said Baff March 25, 1931, be, and the same hereby is, discharged.

And it having been represented to the Court that the said Baff was disbarred from the practice of the law in the United States Patent Office on March 18, 1921, upon charges of misconduct; that his application to be re-registered as a member of the Patent Office Bar was denied upon March 28, 1929, by the Commissioner of Patents; that the action of the Commissioner of Patents in refusing recognition to the said Baff as a patent attorney was sustained by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia on February 19, 1931; and the Court being of the opinion that it possesses inherent power to inquire into the conduct of members of the Bar of this Court and is not limited

It is further ordered that a rule issue, returnable on Monday, November 30th next, to the said William E. Baff, ordering him to show cause why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court, and his name stricken from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice before this Court, upon the ground of misconduct as shown by the Patent Office proceedings and the action of the court thereon as above mentioned.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners,
130 vs.
Ben Terte, Judge of the Circuit Court, etc.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case,
It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is assigned for argument on Monday, November 23rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Transit Commission and State of New York, et al., etc., Appellants,
498 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

ORDER.
It is ordered by the Court that this case be, and the same is hereby, advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, November 23rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company, Appellant,
184 vs.
C. H. Morrissett, State Tax Commissioner, etc.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. The case is placed on the summary docket and assigned for argument on Monday, November 23rd next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

T. Binford, et al., Appellants,
391 vs.
J. H. McLeaish & Company, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. The motion to advance is denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United Drug Company, Appellant,
324 vs.
Frank P. Washburn, Commissioner, etc.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dahlstrom Metallic Door Company, et al., Appellants,
338 vs.
Industrial Board of the State of New York.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

T. Irving Potter, et al., Appellants,
325 vs.
Charles R. Maybury, as Director of Licenses, etc.

Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Harry Blockburger, Petitioner,
374 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, November 23rd after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James Dunn,
Petitioner,
393 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, November 23rd after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Surety Company of New York,
Petitioner,
401 vs.
The Greek Catholic Union.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charley Singleton, Maggie Davis and George Davis,
Petitioners,
403 vs.
Edith Cheek, nee Jackson, Jewel Braziel, nee Jackson, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Aetna Casualty and Surety Company, Petitioner,

413 vs.

Phoenix National Bank and Trust Company of Lexington.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

426 vs.

Charles P. Leininger.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Galveston Wharf Company, et al., Petitioners,

411 vs.

The Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Company, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

D. Ginsberg & Sons, Inc., Petitioner,

429 vs.

Joseph Popkin.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William E. Lamb, Petitioner,

432 vs.

Sterling B. Cramer, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William E. Lamb, Petitioner,

433 vs.

William A. Schmitt, Receiver, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Boston and Maine Railroad,
Petitioner,
477 vs.
Fred Armburg.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Municipal Court of the City of Boston, County of Suffolk, State of Massachusetts, is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

General Motors Corporation and
A C Spark Plug Company,
Petitioners,
442 vs.
Motor Improvements, Inc., and
Ernest J. Sweetland.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

John T. Stone,
Petitioner,
308 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William A. Patterson, Albert E. Rust,
Louis Pfeiffer, et al., etc., Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

309 vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louis Horkeimer and Julius Horkheimer, Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

310 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William M. Taylor, Trustee for Mary
Plomondon Jones, Bankrupt, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court

389 vs. of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

Mary Plomondon Jones, Bankrupt.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

R. E. Kennington, Liquidator, Union Department Store Company, et al.,

Petitioners,

390 vs.

C. L. Donald, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wirt Franklin,

Petitioner,

394 vs.

Frank Carter, State Auditor of the State of Oklahoma.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago Fraternal Life Association,

Petitioner,

395 vs.

Emily H. Karst.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Springfield Court of Appeals, State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Springfield Court of Appeals, State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

F. M. Hubbell Son & Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

400 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

David Burnet, Commissioner of of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Archibald McNeil & Sons Co., Inc., On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court

402 vs. of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

Western Maryland Railway Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States ex rel. Arthur J. Klein,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

404 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Raymond J. Mulligan, Acting United of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

States Marshal.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Kotabs, Inc., Edward Bornstein
and Jacob Benwitt,
Petitioners,
412 vs.
Kotex Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles F. Delbridge, Charles Frederick
Coots and Grace Coots, et al.,
Petitioners,
415 vs.
Arthur J. Oldfield, George C. Oldfield
and Gertrude Oldfield Day, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Milmine Bodman & Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
418 vs.
Empire Canal Corporation, S. S.
"Herkimer," New York Canal & Great
Lakes Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Morris Grain Company of New York, Inc.,

Petitioner,

419 vs. On petition for writ of certiorari

Empire Canal Corporation, S. S. to the United States Circuit Court

Herkimer," New York Canal & Great of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Lakes Corporation.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

City of Willow Glen, On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court

336 vs. of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Southern Pacific Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United Cigar Stores Company of America,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

340 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Darby-Lynde Company,

Petitioner,

398 vs. On petition for writ of certiorari

Acel C. Alexander, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of the State of Oklahoma. to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John B. Ford,

Petitioner,

405 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George Ross Ford,

Petitioner,

406 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Edna F. Knight, Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue. 407

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Mary Ford Bacon, Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue. 408

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Carrie J. Ford, Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue. 409

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Tomas Acevedo, Petitioner,

414 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Portage Silica Company, Petitioner,

416 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States, ex rel. Th. Goldschmidt, A. G., Petitioner,

420 vs.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian and Walter O. Woods, as Treasurer of the United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Irving Trust Company, Receiver, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 421

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dan Hogan, et al., Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 422

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Greater New York Development Company, Petitioner, vs. Annie L. Sears, et al. 424

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Walter Schaefer,

Petitioner,

425 vs.

Frank Collin Bowers, Executor of the Estate of Frank K. Bowers, Former Collector of United States Internal Revenue for the Second District of the State of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. H. Colquitt, Receiver of the Estate of Mrs. M. A. Monroe Smith, et al.,

Petitioners,

428 vs.

Roxana Petroleum Corporation and Douglas Oil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,

Petitioner,

435 vs.

Highway Engineering & Construction Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,

Petitioner,

436 vs.

Highway Engineering & Construction Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,

Petitioner,

437 vs.

Highway Engineering & Construction Company, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
438 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
Highway Engineering & Construction of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.
Company, Inc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
439 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
Highway Engineering & Construction of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.
Company, Inc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
440 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
Highway Engineering & Construction of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.
Company, Inc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George Harvey, Petitioner, vs. American Coal Company, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

443

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ralph J. Capone, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

479

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Vermont, Complainant, vs. The State of New Hampshire. — The motion to amend the bill of complaint herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Warren R. Austin for the complainant.

2, Original.

Saranac Automatic Machine Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Wirebounds Patents Company, et al. — The motion to recall the mandate herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward Stafford in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

51, O.T. 1930.

En-le-te-ke, Charlie Harjo, et al., Petitioners, vs. W. A. Beasley, et al. — The motion to recall the order denying the petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Campbell for the petitioners.

186

Western Distributing Company, Appellant,
337 vs.
The Public Service Commission of the State of Kansas, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert Stone and Mr. Robert D. Garver for the appellant.

United States Cartridge Company, Petitioner,
348 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry LeBaron Sampson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

Moritz Stein; et al., Petitioners,
427 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sanford H. Cohen for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc., as Owner, etc., Petitioner,
430 vs.
Hilda M. Hicks, as Administratrix, etc., et al.;
Vera Alexander, Administratrix, etc., et al., Petitioners,
444 vs.
Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. Roger Englar, Mr. Chauncey I. Clark, Mr. Leonard J. Matteson, and Mr. George S. Brengle for the petitioner in No. 430 and respondent in No. 444; by Mr. Sidney Newborg for the respondents in No. 430; and by Mr. Lucien V. Axtell for the petitioners in No. 444.

Marcel Dreyfus,
Petitioner,
441 vs.
Independence Indemnity Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank S. Monnett and Mr. Howard Morgan Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. I. Vorys for the respondent.

Jenkins-Kreer & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
448 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence N. Goodwin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. William Cutler Thompson for the respondent.

William M. Taylor, Trustee,
Petitioner,
452 vs.
William J. Tayrien, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elmer J. Lundy for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. J. Leahy and Mr. Charles Stuart Macdonald for the respondents.

Patrick J. Hurley, et al.,
Petitioners,
457 vs.
R. Foster Kincaid, Sr.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. A. G. Iverson, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the petitioners, and by Mr. William C. Dufour, Mr. T. J. Freeman, Mr. Gaston Porterie, and Mr. John St. Paul, Jr., for the respondent.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James H. Littlebales, It is ordered that Elwood Hansmann, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Bernard Handlan, It is ordered that Howard D. Matthews, Esquire, of Wheeling, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi H. David, It is ordered that Louis D. Tanenbaum, Esquire, of Corpus Christi, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Warfield Ross, It is ordered that Stanley S. Waite, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence H. Cake, It is ordered that Harry M. Fennemore, Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roger O'Donnell, It is ordered that Lambert O'Donnell, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that Robert C. Handwerk, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that Irwin N. Loeser, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Sun Insurance Office, Petitioner, vs. J. M. Scott. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

28

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Norwich Union Insurance Society, Ltd., Petitioner, vs. J. M. Scott. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

29

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The Home Insurance Company of New York, Petitioner, vs. J. M. Scott. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

30

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

William H. Mecom, Administrator of the
Estate of Archie Lee Smith, Deceased,
Petitioner,
32 vs.
Fitzsimmons Drilling Company, Inc.,
and Atlantic Oil Producing Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma with directions to set aside the judgment and remand the case to the state court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
52 vs.
Edward Walters, a Minor, by Herman Walters, His Father and Next Friend.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Missouri for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Hardware Dealers Mutual Fire Insurance Company of Wisconsin,

Appellant,

4 vs.

The Glidden Company, Marshall Wells Company, Bank of Commerce and Savings, Inc., of Duluth, Minnesota, etc., et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs and interest, until paid, at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the State of Minnesota.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

David W. Phillips, Collector of Internal Revenue, Twelfth District,

18 vs.

Dime Trust & Safe Deposit Company, Executor of the Last Will and Testament of William B. Lewis, etc.

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate and the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Pennsylvania in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The United States of America,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the United

49 vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for

Edward Ryan, Claimant of One Brunswick the Ninth Circuit.

Bar, etc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Louisiana Public Service Commission,

etc., et al.,

Appellants, Appeal from the District Court of the

36 vs. United States for the Eastern District

The Texas & New Orleans Railroad of Louisiana.

Company; Arkansas, Louisiana &

Missouri Railway Company, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

State of Louisiana and Louisiana
Public Service Commission,

Appellants,

37 vs.

The United States of America,
Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Handy and Harman,

Petitioner,

14 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Harry Murdock. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

38

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

DeLaval Steam Turbine Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States. — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

6

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Eugene Bolle. — On writ of Certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, Second District.

60

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, Second District, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Appellate Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Appellate Court of the State of Illinois for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, Chicago and North Western Railway Company, Illinois Central Railroad Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

69 — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Stone in which Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur.

The Permutit Company, Petitioner, vs. Graver Corporation.

3 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. William Kuhn. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

34

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. William Kuhn. — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Ohio, Pike County.

35

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Ohio, Pike County, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals of the State of Ohio for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Western Pacific California Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Southern Pacific Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

51

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

State Tax Commission of Mississippi, et al., etc., Appellants, vs. Interstate Natural Gas Company, Incorporated. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi.

40

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Bandini Petroleum Company, Commodore Petroleum Company, Wilshire Oil Company, et al., Appellants, vs. The Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Los Angeles and Honorable William Hazlett, as One of the Judges thereof. — Appeal from the District Court of Appeal of the State of California, Second Appellate District.

43

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal of the State of California, 2nd Appellate District, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the final order of the said District Court of Appeal denying a writ of prohibition in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cumberland Coal Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Supreme

7 vs. Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments

in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cumberland Coal Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Supreme

8 vs. Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments

in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cumberland Coal Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Supreme

9 vs. Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments

in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cumberland Coal Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Supreme

10 vs. Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments

in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry A. Phillips,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Supreme

11 vs. Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments

in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Piedmont Coal Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Supreme

12 vs. Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments

in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Green County Coal Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the Supreme

13 vs. Court of the State of Pennsylvania.

Board of Revision of Tax Assessments

in Greene County, Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Magno Santovincenzo, Consul of the

Kingdom of Italy at New York,

Appellant, Appeal from the Surrogate's Court

31 vs. of the County of New York,

James F. Egan, Public Administrator, State of New York.

etc., and John J. Bennett, Jr., Attorney

General of the State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Surrogate's Court of the County of New York, State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Magno Santovincenzo, Consul of the
Kingdom of Italy at New York,
Appellant,
vs.
James F. Egan, Public Administrator, etc., and John J. Bennett, Jr., Attorney General of the State of New York.

Appeal from the Surrogate's Court of the County of New York, State of New York.

31

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Surrogate's Court of the County of New York, State of New York, as a petition for writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is ordered by this Court that the petition for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Magno Santovincenzo, Consul of the
Kingdom of Italy at New York,
Appellant,
vs.
James F. Egan, Public Administrator, etc., and John J. Bennett, Jr., Attorney General of the State of New York.

On writ of certiorari to the Surrogate's Court of the County of New York, State of New York.

31

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Surrogate's Court of the County of New York, State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the decree and order of the said Surrogate's Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Surrogate's Court of the County of New York for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Howes Brothers Hide Company, et al. 294

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Howes Brothers Hide Company, et al. 294

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. George Anderson. 50

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. George Anderson. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

50

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, ~~reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby,~~ reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced:

In view of the large number of such orders, the other orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements, and upon applications for writs of certiorari, as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the Clerk of the Court.

David Threatt,

Petitioner,

446 vs.

American Mutual Liability Insurance Co., et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Threatt,

Petitioner,

446 vs.

American Mutual Liability Insurance Co., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Nannie Lee King,

Petitioner,

476 vs.

Mrs. Sarah Peterson and Benjamin L. Jaffe.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Nannie Lee King,

Petitioner,

476 vs.

Mrs. Sarah Peterson and Benjamin L. Jaffe.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

In the matter of the disbarment of H. A. Ledbetter.

The report of the Committee of the Bar of this Court, appointed pursuant to the order of April 22, 1930, is received and

It is ordered that the said Committee be, and the same is hereby, discharged with the thanks of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Vermont,

Complainant,

2 Original. vs.

The State of New Hampshire.

On consideration of the motion to amend the bill of complaint in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Duramac Automatic Machine Corporation,

Petitioner,

51, O.T. 1930. vs.

Wirebounds Patents Company.

On consideration of the motion by petitioner to recall or supplement the mandate in this case,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Western Distributing Company,
Appellant,
337 vs.
The Public Service Commission of the State of Kansas, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Patrick J. Hurley, et al.,
Petitioners,
457 vs.
R. Foster Kincaid, Sr.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, January 4th next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Cartridge Company,
Petitioner,
348 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc., as Owner of the Motorboat "Linseed King," etc.,
Petitioner,
430 vs.
Hilda M. Hicks, as Administratrix, etc., et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Vera Alexander, Administratrix of the Estate of James Alexander, Deceased, et al., Petitioners,
444 vs.
Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gong Bell Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
97 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

City Button Works, Petitioner,
293 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Onondaga Company,

Petitioner,

320 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Ten Eyck Company,

Petitioner,

321 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jos. Denunzio Fruit Company,

Petitioner,

381 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Moritz Stein, Anton Lagattuta and
Emil Porges,
Petitioners,
427 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Marcel Dreyfus,
Petitioner,
441 vs.
Independence Indemnity Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Irving Trust Company, as Permanent Receiver
in Equity of Henry Munroe, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
445 vs.
Olivier Straw Goods Corporation and
Chartered Bank of India, Australia
and China.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jenkins-Kreer & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
448 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William M. Taylor, Trustee,
Petitioner,
452 vs.
William J. Tayrien, Fay Revard, George Alawishes Tayrien, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Michael Devasto, alias Mike Devasto, et al.,
Petitioners,
491 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file brief of the respondent by December 4 next,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert M. Leach, Executor, etc., Petitioner, 468 vs. Malcolm E. Nichols, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. O. Walker Taylor in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Attorney General of Massachusetts as amicus curiae, in this cause.
First National Bank of Boston, Executor, etc., Appellant, 171 vs. State of Maine.	On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. Godfrey G. Goodwin, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Minnesota as amicus curiae, in this cause.
Arizona Grocery Company, Petitioner, 98 vs. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, et al.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. Harry L. Underwood, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
Arizona Grocery Company, Petitioner, 98 vs. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, et al.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. John E. Benton, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the National Association of Railroads and Utility Commissioners, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
Arizona Grocery Company, Petitioner, 98 vs. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, et al.	The motion for leave to file brief of Felix T. Smith and others, as amici curiae, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Benton, and the motion was denied.
Fox Folm Corporation, Appellant, 118 vs. R. C. Norman, State Tax Commissioner.	The expiration of the term of office of R. C. Norman, State Tax Commissioner, and the appointment of Paul H. Doyal of State Tax Commissioner having been suggested,

It is on motion of Mr. W. A. Sutherland, counsel for appellant, ordered by this Court that Paul H. Doyal, present State Tax Commissioner, be substituted and made the party appellee in this cause.

The State of New Jersey,
Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
The City of New York.

The report of the special master upon rereference was presented to the Court by Mr. Edward K. Campbell, the special master herein.

—, Original.
Ex parte: A. W. Estabrook.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis and for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. W. Estabrook pro se.

John F. Hanson,
Appellant,
447 vs.
Dan Kramer, et al.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Hanson, pro se.

The Packer Corporation,
Appellant,
357 vs.
The State of Utah.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dan B. Shields for the appellant.

Bradford Electric Light Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
423 vs.
Jennie M. Clapper, Administratrix.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Leahy for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. John E. Benton for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

John F. Hanson,
Appellant,
447 vs.
Dan Kramer, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. Hanson pro se.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Bates for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Louis R. Mehlinger, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Bradford Electric Light Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
vs.
Jennie M. Clapper, Administratrix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William E. Leahy for the petitioner, and by Mr. John E. Benton for the respondent.

Henry Peterson,
Petitioner,
vs.
Naknek Packing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. H. Dunn for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis V. Keesling for the respondent.

Howard N. Eavenson,
Petitioner,
vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Seifert and Mr. Wm. Wallace Booth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Rayner N. Larson, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Charles W. Dahlinger,
Petitioner,
451 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Seifert and Mr. Wm. Wallace Booth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Hayner N. Larson, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
453 vs.
Hannah R. Temple, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas W. Davis and Mr. Douglas McKay for the petitioner, and by Mr. John F. Williams and Mr. R. E. Whiting for the respondent.

Franklin-American Trust Company,
Petitioner,
455 vs.
St. Louis Union Trust Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Rose, Mr. D. H. Cantrell, Mr. J. F. Loughborough, Mr. A. W. Dobyns, and Mr. A. F. House for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas S. McPheeters, Mr. Monny Davis, and Mr. Charles T. Coleman for the respondent.

Lawrence C. O'Brien,
Petitioner,
456 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. O'Callaghan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John W. McEvers for the respondent.

Angier Corporation, Petitioner,
458 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
Angier Corporation, Petitioner,
459 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George T. Weitzel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. S. Dee Hanson, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the respondent.

Clarence W. Haggerty,
Petitioner,
460 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leslie P. Whelan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Bank of America of California,
Ancillary Guardian, etc., Petitioner,
461 vs.
The Fulton Trust Company of New York,
et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. U. S. Webb, Mr. Raymond Benjamin, Mr. Charles D. Hamel, and Mr. John Enrietto for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. John S. Flannery, and Mr. C. Bowdoin Craighill for the respondents.

Baton Coal Company, Petitioner,
464 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William A. Seifert and Mr. William Wallace Booth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John MacC. Hudson, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

National Pressure Cooker Company, Petitioner,
465 vs.
Mabel Stroeter.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. P. M. Beach for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry F. Payer for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
466 vs.
Daniel M. Lefkowitz and Pauline Paris.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the petitioner, and by Mr. David P. Seigel for the respondent.

Lulu Vance Baumgartner, Petitioner,
467 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen L. Chickering, Mr. Walter C. Fox, Jr., and Mr. Blair S. Shuman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John H. McEvers, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Robert M. Leach, Executor, etc., Petitioner,
468 vs.
Malcolm E. Nichols, Formerly Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. Walker Taylor for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. William Cutler Thompson, and Mr. C. M. Charest, ~~and Mr. William T. Gossett, Jr.,~~ for the respondent.

George L. Shearer, Petitioner,
469 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
William A. W. Stewart, Petitioner,
470 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Henry Butler for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Norman D. Keller, and Mr. F. Edward Mitchell for the respondent.

Los Angeles Dock and Terminal Company, Petitioner,
473 vs.
Pacific Dock and Terminal Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., Mr. William J. Hughes, Mr. Walter M. Campbell, and Mr. W. H. Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. T. T. C. Gregory for the respondent.

Southern Pacific Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners,
474 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby, Mr. Frank Thunen, and Mr. Guy F. Shoup for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. E. T. Burke for the respondent.

Abe Danciger, et al., etc., Petitioners,
478 vs.
Floyd E. Jacobs, Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. I. J. Ringolsky and Mr. Harry L. Jacobs for the petitioner.

Commerce Farm Credit Company,
Petitioner,
480 vs.
J. E. Shropshire, et ux. L. A. Shropshire.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert J. McMillan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Crawford B. Reeder for the respondent.

Southern Railway Company,
Petitioners,
481 vs.
Eagle Cotton Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Clark and Mr. W. N. McGehee for the petitioners, and by Mr. Nuel D. Belnap, Mr. Luther M. Walter, and Mr. John S. Burchmore for the respondent.

American Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
483 vs.
General Motors Acceptance Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. A. Hammond, Mr. Alston Cockrell, and Mr. Alex. W. Smith, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. N. B. K. Pettingill and Mr. T. M. Shackleford, Jr., for the respondent.

W. E. Hedger Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
484 vs.
The United States of America.

The petititon for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace T. Atkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Canada Malting Company, Ltd., Petitioner,

487 vs.

Patterson Steamships, Ltd.;

British Empire Grain Company, Ltd., Petitioner,

488 vs.

Patterson Steamships, Ltd.;

Henry K. Starnes, doing business as H. K. Starnes & Company, Petitioner,

489 vs.

Patterson Steamships, Ltd.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by ~~Mr. Henry J. Bigham~~, Mr. D. Roger Englar, Mr. Oscar R. Houston, and Mr. Leonard J. Matteson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Ray M. Stanley and Mr. Ellis H. Gibley for the respondent.

Michael Devasto, alias Mike Devasto, et al., Petitioners,

491 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sanford H. Cohen for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. A. E. Gottschall and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

New York Title and Mortgage Company, Petitioner,

493 vs.

First National Bank, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James C. Rogers and Mr. Henry S. Conrad for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur Mag for the respondent.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, etc., Petitioner,

495 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel W. Moore and Mr. F. M. Moore for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. Morton K. Rothschild, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

United Brick and Tile Company,
Petitioner,
497 vs.
E. R. McKissick, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. J. Flick, Mr. Silas H. Strawn, and Mr. H. M. Havner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles S. Bradshaw for the respondents.

Manhattan Oil Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
499 vs.
George A. Mosby.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George L. Edwards for the petitioners, and by Mr. H. M. Langworthy for the respondent.

The Territory of Hawaii, by C. T. Bailey, Commissioner of Public Lands,
Petitioner,
500 vs.
Francis Gay, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank E. Thompson for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. G. M. Robertson, Mr. Mason F. Prosser, Mr. Benjamin L. Marx, and Mr. Robbins B. Anderson for the respondents.

William Lias, et al.,
Petitioners,
325 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Howard D. Matthews for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is now opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul M. Segal, It is ordered that Meyer Bernstein, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Hostetter, It is ordered that James A. Brearley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Theodore A. Hostetter, It is ordered that Harold M. Jacobs, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry R. Miller, Jr., It is ordered that W. W. Martin, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles F. Consaul, It is ordered that James F. Casey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Rigby, It is ordered that J. Henri Brown, Esquire, of San Juan, Territory of Porto Rico, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Robert M. Leach, Executor, etc., Petitioner,	On motion made to the Court in that behalf by Mr. O. Walker Taylor, leave was granted petitioner to file a reply brief on or before December 5 next.
468 vs.	
Malcolm E. Nichols, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue.	
William Lias, et al., Petitioners,	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. J. Bernard Handlan for the petitioner.
328 vs.	
The United States of America.	
Harry Blockburger, Petitioner,	This case was argued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent, and the case was submitted by Mr. Harold J. Bandy for the petitioner.
374 vs.	
The United States of America.	
James Dunn, Petitioner,	This case was argued by Mr. Roger O'Donnell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.
393 vs.	
The United States of America.	

Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. Ben Terte, Judge of the Circuit Court of Jackson County, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Thomas Hackney for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clay C. Rogers for the respondent.
Transit Commission and State of New York, et al., etc., Appellants, vs. The United States of America, Long Island Railroad Company, and Interstate Commerce Commission.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George H. Stover for the appellants.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that Bradley B. Gilman, Esquire, of Worcester, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, It is ordered that J. D. Skeen, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carter Smith, It is ordered that Amil N. Japp, Esquire, of Lawton, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. A. Van-Orsdel, It is ordered that Alton E. Laughlin, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gustav Miller, It is ordered that Chester W. Johnson, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, It is ordered that William D. F. Carey, Esquire, of Hutchinson, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Transit Commission and State of New York, et al., etc., Appellants,
498 vs.
The United States of America, Long Island Railroad Company, and Interstate Commerce Commission.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. George H. Stover for the appellants; by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for appellees, the United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission; and concluded by Mr. Alfred A. Gardner for appellee, the Long Island Railroad Company.

The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company, Appellant,
184 vs.
C. H. Morrissett, State Tax Commissioner for the State of Virginia, et al., etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Thomas B. Gay for the appellant and by Mr. W. W. Martin for the appellees.

American Hide and Leather Company, Petitioner,
62 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William E. Hayes for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. George E. Hamilton for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next, at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John D. Ellis, It is ordered that Jacob Hauptman, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Beye, It is ordered that Paul R. Conaghan, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. M. Thompson, It is ordered that Maurice H. Greene, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Edward Hirsch, It is ordered that Morris E. Levinson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Lauderdale, It is ordered that Edward W. Smith, Esquire, of Clarksdale, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Lauderdale, It is ordered that Sam C. Cook, Esquire, of Clarksdale, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. C. Fulbright, It is ordered that Frank L. Snell, Jr., Esquire, of Phoenix, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. Greenwood, It is ordered that Richard J. Jackson, Esquire, of Cheyenne, State of Wyoming, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, It is ordered that Wilton H. Wallace, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly, It is ordered that Joseph J. Sheehan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that Edgar Watkins, Jr., Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley E. Disney, It is ordered that Robert Wallace Kellough, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, It is ordered that John G. Somers, Esquire, of Newton, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Helen Rembert Carloss, It is ordered that Julia M. H. Carson, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Levi Cooke, It is ordered that Albert D. Cash, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Albert A. Hoeper,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

17 vs. State of Wisconsin.

Tax Commission of Wisconsin and

Marathon County, Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Holmes in which Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Stone concur.

The United States of America, Interstate
Commerce Commission, and Hoboken
Manufacturers' Railroad Company,
Appellants,
33 vs.
Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company,
The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey,
The Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago and
St. Louis Railway Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Stone in which Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

William Lias, Joe Fragale, and
Theodore Prosos, Petitioners,
328 vs.
The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of West Virginia.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Company, Appellant,
184 vs.
C. H. Morrissett, State Tax Commissioner for the State of Virginia, et al., etc., et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John F. Hanson, Appellant,
447 vs.
Dan Kramer, J. Oscar Stromquist, William N. Olson and Tillie Hedquist.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John F. Hanson, Appellant,
447 vs.
Dan Kramer, J. Oscar Stromquist, William N. Olson and Tillie Hedquist.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced:

In view of the large number of such orders, the other orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements, and upon applications for writs of certiorari, as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the Clerk of the Court.

—, Original.

Ex Parte: A. W. Estabrook, Petitioner,

On consideration of the motions for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Packer Corporation, Appellant;

357 vs.

The State of Utah.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner,

339 vs.

The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted, limited to the question raised with respect to Engineer Officers of the War Department in performing duties in time of peace in connection with rivers and harbors improvements and the meetings of the California Debris Commission.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
453 vs.
Hannah R. Temple, Administratrix of the Estate of Joseph R. Temple, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Franklin-American Trust Company,
Petitioner,
455 vs.
St. Louis Union Trust Company, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
466 vs.
Daniel M. Lefkowitz and Pauline Paris.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George L. Shearer, Petitioner,

469 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William A. W. Stewart, Petitioner,

470 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Canada Malting Company, Ltd., Petitioner,

487 vs.

Paterson Steamships, Ltd.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

British Empire Grain Company, Ltd.,
Petitioner,
488 vs.
Paterson Steamships, Ltd.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry K. Starnes, doing business as H. K. Starnes & Company,
Petitioner,
489 vs.
Paterson Steamships, Ltd.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry Peterson,
Petitioner,
431 vs.
Naknek Packing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Howard M. Evenson, Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

450

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles W. Dahlinger, Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

451

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lawrence C. O'Brien, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

456

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Angier Corporation, Petitioner,
458 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Angier Corporation, Petitioner,
459 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bank of America of California, Ancillary Guardian of James McDonald, 3d, et al., Petitioners,
461 vs.
The Fulton Trust Company of New York and Joseph S. Graydon, Trustees, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Eaton Coal Company, Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue. 464

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

National Pressure Cooker Company, Petitioner, vs. Mabel Stroeter. 465

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lulu Vance Baumgartner, Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue. 467

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Los Angeles Dock and Terminal
Company,
Petitioner,
473 vs.
Pacific Dock and Terminal Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Pacific Railroad Company and
Southern Pacific Land Company,
Petitioners,
474 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Abe Danciger, Jack Danciger, Joe
Danciger, Partners, etc.,
Petitioners,
478 vs.
Floyd E. Jacobs, Administrator, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commerce Farm Credit Company,

Petitioner,

480 vs.

J. E. Shropshire, et ux. L. A. Shropshire.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway Company, et al.,

Petitioners,

481 vs.

Eagle Cotton Oil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

483 vs.

General Motors Acceptance Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. E. Hedger Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

484

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New York Title and Mortgage Company, Petitioner, vs. First National Bank, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

493

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Kansas City Southern Railway Company, etc., Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

495

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United Brick and Tile Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

497 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

E. R. McKissick, Cora B. McKissick, of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

J. A. McKissick, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Manhattan Oil Company, Phillips Petroleum

Company and Empire Gas and Fuel Company, On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court

499 vs. of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

George A. Mosby.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Territory of Hawaii, by C. T. Bailey,

Commissioner of Public Lands,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

500 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Francis Gay, Aubrey Robinson, Alice of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Robinson, et al., etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Andrew B. Keating, as Receiver, etc., et al., Appellants,
71 vs.
The Public National Bank of New York.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Herbert A. Hickman, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the City of Buffalo, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

William Stevens, Petitioner,
217 vs.
The Vessel "White City," her engines, etc.

The motion as to the printing of the record in this cause was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles C. Collins in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

Ellison Ranching Company, Appellant,
522 vs.
George A. Bartlett.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Skeen for the appellant.

Boston and Maine Railroad, Petitioner,
477 vs.
Fred Armburg.

The motion to amend the petition for writ of certiorari herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Abbot P. Mills in behalf of counsel for the petitioner in support of the motion, and by Mr. Clarence W. Manley for the respondent in opposition thereto.

Super Maid Cook-Ware Corporation, Petitioner,
490 vs.
James E. Hamil, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin C. Hollins for the petitioner.

Samuel J. Kearing, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. Mangan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. John J. Byrne for the respondent.
492	
E. C. Waddington, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Preston P. Sweeten, Bankrupt, Petitioner, vs. Hamilton G. Pedrick.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank A. Mathews, Jr., for the petitioner.
501	
Jack Hardeman, Petitioner, vs. Albert T. Witbeck.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the petitioner.
503	
The Hodge Drive-it-Yourself Company, The Barrs Self Driver Company, Inc., et al., Appellants, vs. The City of Cincinnati, et al., etc.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Julius R. Samuels for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.
63	
Andrew B. Keating, as Receiver, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. The Public National Bank of New York.	This case was argued by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly for the appellants, and by Mr. Martin Saxe and Mr. Robert C. Beatty for the appellee.
71	
Broad-Grace Arcade Corporation, Appellant, vs. J. Fulmer Bright, Mayor of the City	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Andrew D. Christian for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Collins Denny, Jr., for the appellees.
72	

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, It is ordered that Thomas W. Dahlquist, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. C. Fulbright, It is ordered that Frank A. Leffingwell, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James E. Lyons, It is ordered that A. Burton Mason, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. U. Bon Geaslin, It is ordered that Victor Packman, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sam Rayburn, It is ordered that J. T. Suggs, Jr., Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Broad-Grace Arcade Corporation, Appellant,
72 vs.
J. Fulmer Bright, Mayor of the City of Richmond, et al., etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Collis Denny, Jr., for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. Andrew D. Christian for the appellant.

The Chapel State Theatre Company, Appellant,
77 vs.
Fred W. Hooper, doing business as F. W. Hooper Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Albert D. Cash for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad Company, Petitioner,
79 vs.
Industrial Commission of Illinois and Joe Thomas.

This case was argued by Mr. Edward W. Rawlins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel E. Hirsch for the respondents.

W. L. Matthews, et al., Appellants,
84 vs.
J. F. Rodgers, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. A. Lauderdale for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, It is ordered that Albert M. Levert, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Dill, It is ordered that Fred J. Cunningham, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred Van-Dolsen, It is ordered that Scott Russell, Esquire, of Macon, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

W. L. Mathews, et al., Appellants,
84 vs.
J. F. Rogers, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Sam C. Cook and Mr. Edward W. Smith for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. J. A. Lauderdale for the appellants.

Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway Company, Petitioner,
86 vs.
Richard R. Churchill, Administrator, etc.;
Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway Company, Petitioner,
87 vs.
Richard R. Churchill, Administrator, etc.

These cases were argued by Mr. Paul R. Conaghan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Herbert H. Patterson for the respondent.

William J. Stratton, as Secretary, etc., Appellant,
178 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Bayard Lacey Catron for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Josiah Whitnel for the appellee.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Borah, It is ordered that James F. Ailshie, Jr., Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Feely, It is ordered that Gregory A. Harrison, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Amos Shriver,
Appellant,
158 vs.
Woodbine Savings Bank of Woodbine, Iowa.

This case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James M. Parsons for the appellant and by Mr. H. L. Robertson for the appellee.

William J. Stratton, as Secretary, etc., Appellants,

178 vs.

St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Josiah Whitnel for the appellee.

State of Wyoming, Complainant,

15, Original. vs.

State of Colorado.

This case was argued on the motion to dismiss the bill of complaint by Mr. Paul W. Lee for the defendant in support of the motion, and by Mr. James A. Greenwood for the complainant in opposition thereto.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, et al., Appellants,

287 vs.

The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

Five and one-half hours were allowed for the oral argument of this case. The argument commenced by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward [illegible]. Humphrey, It is ordered that Charles N. Hobson, Esquire, of Frankfort, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Crosser, It is ordered that Edward J. Schweid, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William F. Stevenson, It is ordered that M. Rutledge Rivers, Esquire, of Charleston, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway Company, et al., Appellants,
287 vs.
The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the appellants; by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for appellees, the United States and Interstate Commerce Commission; by Mr. John E. Benton for appellees, the State Commission of the State of Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, and Wyoming; by Mr. Ralph LeMaster for the appellee, Nebraska State Railway Commission; and concluded by Mr. Frederick H. Wood for the appellants; and the case was submitted by Mr. Charles W. Steiger and Mr. Ralph Merriam for the appellee, Public Service Commission of the State of Kansas.

Southern Railway Company, Appellant,
300 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky;
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, Appellant,
301 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Edward P. Humphrey for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wade H. Ellis, It is ordered that Edward M. Biddle, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Dozier A. DeVane, It is ordered that Robert W. Shackleford, Esquire, of Tampa, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burnita Matthews, It is ordered that Gail Laughlin, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Daniel Thew Wright, It is ordered that William P. Beeber, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Melvin C. Light, Esquire, of Lima, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that James J. Meadock, Esquire of Lima, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Ernest M. Botkin, Esquire, of Lima, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, It is ordered that Frederick L. Pearce, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George M. Morris, It is ordered that Stanley R. Foot, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that H. E. Garling, Esquire, of Lima, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Russell, It is ordered that Louis P. Pink, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund B. Quiggle, It is ordered that Stewart K. Powell, Esquire, of Onancock, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edmund B. Quiggle; It is ordered that George L. Doughty, Esquire, of Accomac, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Frank C. Laughlin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior,	Petitioner,	On writ of certiorari to the
66 vs.		Court of Appeals of the
The United States of America, ex rel. The Vindicator Consolidated Gold Mining Company.		District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with directions to award a writ of mandamus requiring the Secretary of the Interior to proceed to an examination and adjustment of the claim in question conformably to the statutes as construed in the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of
the Interior,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

67 vs. Court of Appeals of the

The United States of America ex rel. District of Columbia.
Chestatee Pyrites & Chemical Corporation.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with directions to award a writ of mandamus requiring the Secretary of the Interior to proceed to an examination and adjustment of the claim in question conformably to the statutes as construed in the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

I. J. Van Huffel,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

54 vs. Court of Appeals of the State

Trace D. Markelrode, Treasurer of of Ohio, Trumbull County.
Trumbull County, Ohio, etc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Ohio, Trumbull County, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

I. J. Van Huffel,
Petitioner,
55 vs.
Trace D. Markelrode, Treasurer of Trumbull County, Ohio, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Bradford Electric Light Company, Inc.,
Appellant,
423 vs.
Jennie M. Clapper, Administratrix.

Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bradford Electric Light Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
423 vs.
Jennie M. Clapper, Administratrix.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

State of New Jersey, Complainant,

11, Original. vs. DECREE.

The City of New York.

This cause came on to be heard upon the pleadings, evidence, and the exceptions filed by the defendant to the report of the special master, the report of the special master on re-reference and the form of decree prepared and filed by counsel for the parties. The court being fully advised in the premises, and for the purpose of carrying into effect the decision announced May 18, 1931, 283 U. S. 473, and the report of the special master on re-reference filed November 23, 1931,

It is ordered, adjudged and decreed as follows:

1. On and after June 1, 1933, the defendant, The City of New York, its employees and agents, and all persons assuming to act under its authority, be and they are hereby enjoined from dumping, or procuring or suffering to be dumped, any garbage or refuse, or other noxious, offensive or injurious matter, into the ocean, or waters of the United States, off the coast of New Jersey, and from otherwise defiling or polluting said waters and the shores or beaches thereof or procuring them to be defiled or polluted as aforesaid.

2. That meanwhile the defendant, The City of New York, its employees and agents, and other persons assuming to act under its authority, be and they are hereby enjoined to operate and utilize the existing incinerators and other facilities for the final disposition of garbage and refuse in such a manner as to reduce to the lowest practicable limit the amount of garbage dumped at sea.

3. That the defendant, The City of New York, shall file with the Clerk of this Court, on the first days of April, and October of each year, beginning April 1, 1932, a report to this Court adequately setting forth the progress made in the construction of incinerator plants for the final disposition of garbage and refuse, and their appurtenances, and also the amount of garbage and refuse dumped at sea during the periods covered by such reports.

4. That on the coming in of each of said reports, and on due notice to the other party, either party to this suit may apply to the Court for such action or relief, either with respect to the time allowed for the construction, or the progress of construction, or the method of operation, of the proposed incinerator plants or other means of final disposition of garbage and refuse, or with respect to the quantities, places or character of the dumping of garbage and refuse at sea, as may be deemed to be appropriate.

5. That either of the parties hereto may, irrespective of the filing of the above-described reports, apply at the foot of this decree for any other or further action or relief, and this Court retains jurisdiction of the above-entitled suit for the purpose of any order or direction, or modification of this decree, or any supplemental decree, which it may deem at any time to be proper in relation to the subject matter in controversy.

And it is further ordered that the costs of this suit, the expenses incurred by the special master and his compensation, to be fixed by the Court, shall be taxable against the defendant.

Andrew B. Keating, as Receiver of Taxes of the City of New York, and William Reid, Jr., as City Collector, Appellants, vs. The Public National Bank of New York. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

71

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and on motion to dismiss or affirm, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Broad-Grace Arcade Corporation, Appellant, vs. J. Fulmer Bright, Mayor of the City of Richmond, et al., etc. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia.

72

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court denying an interlocutory injunction in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, but without prejudice to the power and duty of the District Court, as specially constituted, to inquire and determine whether the court has jurisdiction both in relation to the amount involved in the controversy, and with respect to the right of the complainant to maintain this suit in equity.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chapel State Theatre Company,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

77 vs. State of Ohio.

Fred W. Hooper, Doing Business as

F. W. Hooper Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway

Company, Petitioner,

86 vs. On writ of certiorari to the Appellate

Richard R. Churchill, Administrator Court of the State of Illinois,

of the Estate of Roy W. Brown, First District.

Deceased.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, First District, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

87 vs.

Richard R. Churchill, Administrator of the Estate of Roy W. Brown, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Stevens,

Petitioner,

217 vs.

The Vessel "White City," her engines, etc.

On consideration of the motion as to printing the record in this cause, It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied, without prejudice to the authority of this Court to make such order as to costs as it may deem proper, if it appear that either party shall have caused unnecessary parts of the record to be printed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Boston and Maine Railroad,

Petitioner,

477 vs.

Fred Armburg.

On consideration of the motion to amend the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause, It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ellison Ranching Company,
Appellant,
522 vs.
George A. Bartlett.

On consideration of the motion to advance this case,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert M. Leach, Executor, etc.,
Petitioner,
468 vs.
Malcolm H. Nichols, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jack Mardeman,
Petitioner,
503 vs.
Albert T. Witbeck.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Super Maid Cook-Ware Corporation,
Petitioner,
490 vs.
James E. Hamil, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Michael Devasto, alias Mike Devasto,
George Burt, Nicholas Potenti, et al., Petitioners,
491 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Samuel J. Kearing, Petitioner,
492 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

E. C. Waddington, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Preston P. Sweeten, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
501 vs.
Hamilton G. Pedrick.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order:

ORDER.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, December 14th, until Monday, January 4th, 1932.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

First National Bank of Boston, Executor, etc., Petitioner,
171 vs.
State of Maine.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Henry J. Richardson, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of James Turner, Henry E. Worcester, and Central Manover Bank and Trust Company, Executors of the estate of James M. Jarvie, deceased, as amici curiae, in this cause.

Marine Transit Corporation and Tug "Gerald A. Fagan," by Marine Transit Corporation, Claimant, Petitioner,
172 vs.
Louis Louis Dreyfus and Charles Louis Dreyfus, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Kenneth Dayton, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York and The American Arbitration Association, Inc., as amici curiae, in this cause.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States, Petitioner,
505 vs.
The People of the State of New York, by James A. Beha, Superintendent of Insurance, etc.

The motion by Herman F. M. Matzenbecher, et al., to continue on their own behalf the petition filed herein in the name of the Alien Property Custodian, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan Ottinger in support of the motion, and by Mr. Alfred C. Bennett for the respondent, in opposition thereto.

John Borum, John Logan, and Milton Gay, 530 vs. The United States of America.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis and to bring up the entire record and cause and to print certificate, record, and briefs at public expense was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. O'Shea for John Borum, et al.
Claiborne-Annapolis Ferry Company, Appellant, 454 vs. The United States of America, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jesse I. Miller, Mr. George E.Edelen, and Mr. Philip B. Perlman for the appellant.
New State Ice Company, Appellant, 463 vs. Ernest A. Liebmann.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. Dudley and Mr. J. M. Everest for the appellant.
G. M. Saunders, Appellant, 472 vs. The State of Georgia.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Branch and Mr. Wm. Schley Howard for the appellant.
Irene Elizabeth Capron and Irene Elizabeth Capron, as Administratrix, etc., Petitioners, 496 vs. Erwin Ray Van Horn.	The petition for a writ of certi rari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Haines for the petitioners, and by Mr. M. W. Conkling for the respondent.
Anna L. Siegel, et al., etc., Petitioners, 502 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank H. Sullivan for

the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States, Petitioner,

505 vs.

The People of the State of New York, by James A. Beha, Superintendent of Insurance, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan Ottinger and Mr. Charles J. Schuck for the petitioner, and by Mr. LeRoy B. Inerman and Mr. Alfred C. Bennett for the respondent.

New Era Motors, Inc., et al., Petitioners,

510 vs.

Carl W. Burst, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. Mayner Wallace and Mr. T. M. Pierce for the petitioners.

Navigazione Libera Triestina and Steamship "Carso," etc., Petitioners,

515 vs.

Molinelli, Giannusa & Rao, Inc., et al.;

Navigazione Libera Triestina and Steamship "Carso," etc., Petitioners,

516 vs.

R. Gerber & Company, et al.;

Navigazione Libera Triestina and Steamship "Carso," etc., Petitioners,

517 vs.

Italian Importing Company of New York;

Navigazione Libera Triestina and Steamship "Carso," etc., Petitioners,

518 vs.

Western Sausage & Provision Company;

Navigazione Libera Triestina and Steamship "Carso," etc., Petitioners,

519 vs.

Robert Kurtz, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer L. Loomis for the petitioners, and by Mr. Horace T. Atkins and Mr. Harry D. Thirkield for the respondents.

Southern Railway Company, Appellant,
300 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky;
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, Appellant,
301 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Edward P. Humphrey for the appellants, and by Mr. Charles N. Hobson for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Charles W. Milner for the appellants.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, et al., Appellants,
88 vs.
The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Carl H. Davis for the appellants; continued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellees, The United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission; by Mr. W. S. O'B. Robinson, Jr., for the appellee Piedmont and Northern Ry. Co., and concluded by Mr. F. B. Crier for the appellants.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, It is ordered that John G. Simms, Esquire, of Orlando, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wilton W. Shreve, It is ordered that J. Orin Waite, Esquire, of Erie, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Walter W. Hunt, Mark L. Garvin, et al., Appellants,
449 vs.
City of Oklahoma City, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file the statement as to jurisdiction in this cause out of time, It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

L. A. Nixon, Petitioner, vs. James Condon and C. H. Kolle. 265	On motion made to the Court by Mr. Charles H. Houston, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of C. H. Love and others as amici curiae, in this cause.
Arizona Grocery Company, Petitioner, vs. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, et al. 98	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Frank L. Snell, Jr., for the petitioner, continued by Mr. R. C. Fulbright for the petitioner and by Mr. Burton Mason for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. R. C. Fulbright for the petitioner.
Nellie Field Burwell, Sole Devisee, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. James T. Powell and John S. Daisy. 112	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. James E. Heath for the appellants, continued by Mr. Stewart K. Powell for the appellees. The Court declined to hear further argument.
Edgar Percy Lewis, et al., as Trustees, etc., Petitioners, vs. Marshall S. Reynolds, Individually, etc. 115	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. H. E. Corthell for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. F. Henderson, It is ordered that James M. Lynch, Esquire, of Florence, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. F. Henderson, It is ordered that Shepard K. Nash, Esquire, of Sumter, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. F. Henderson, It is ordered that Benjamin A. Morgan, Esquire, of Greenville, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Fisher, It is ordered that Francis C. Hutchens, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. A. Ayers, It is ordered that Carl V. Rice, Esquire, of Parsons, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carroll L. Beedy, It is ordered that Leonard A. Pierce, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roscoe C. Patterson, It is ordered that John W. Palmer, Esquire, of Sedalia, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carroll L. Beedy, It is ordered that Clement F. Robinson, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carroll L. Beedy, It is ordered that Herbert J. Connell, Esquire, of Portland, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, It is ordered that Winthrop B. Lane, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Edgar Percy Lewis, et al., etc., Petitioners,	The argument of this case was continued
115 vs.	by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Young-
Marshall S. Reynolds, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue.	quist for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. N. W. Corthell for the petitioners.
Matson Navigation Company, Petitioner,	This case was argued by Mr. Gregory A.
137 vs.	Harrison for the petitioner, and by Mr.
The United States.	Claude R. Branch for the respondent.
Yale Oil Corporation of South Dakota, Appellant,	The argument of this case was commenced
159 vs.	by Mr. Frederick L. Pearce for the
The State of Montana.	appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.
United States of America, ex rel. Asgasia Polymeris and Antigone Polymeris, Petitioners,	This case was argued by Mr. Harold Van-
162 vs.	Riper for the petitioners, and by Mr.
Joseph W. Trudell, Immigration Inspector in Charge.	Claude R. Branch for the respondent.
The United States of America,	The argument of this case was commenced
163 vs.	by Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the
Leonard Vanbierliet.	United States.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George O. Compton, It is ordered that Harry E. Powers, Esquire, of Whiting, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eliot C. Lovett, It is ordered that John N. Penick, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Lillian Clawans, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George V. A. McCloskey, It is ordered that Henry Ellwood Otto, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George V. A. Mallabey, It is ordered that Lester Hand Jayne, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis F. Glenn, It is ordered that James B. Wolfenbarger, Esquire, of Peoria, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

First National Bank of Boston, Executor, etc., Appellant,
171 vs.
State of Maine.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Russell L. Bradford, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the City Bank Farmers Trust Co., of New York, as executor of the last will and testament of Virgil P. Kline, deceased, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

First National Bank of Boston, Executor, etc., Appellant,
171 vs.
State of Maine.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Seth T. Cole, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Tax Commission of the State of New York, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

The United States of America,
163 vs.
Leonard Vanbiervliet.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the United States, and the case was submitted by Mr. Martin J. Kilsdonk for Vanbiervliet.

A. H. Averill, as Insurance Commissioner of the State of Oregon, Appellant,

165 vs.

Northwestern National Insurance Company of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

This case was argued by Mr. I. H. Van Winkle for the appellant, and by Mr. Thomas MacMahon for the appellee.

Gregg Dyeing Company, Appellant,

170 vs.

W. G. Query, et al., etc.;

The City of Greenville, etc., et al., Appellants,

245 vs.

W. G. Query, et al., etc.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. James M. Lynch for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

First National Bank of Boston, Executor, etc., Appellant,

171 vs.

State of Maine.

This case was argued by Mr. Leonard A. Pierce for the appellant, and by Mr. Clement F. Robinson for the appellee.

Marine Transit Corporation, etc., Petitioner,

172 vs.

Louis Louis Dreyfus, et al., etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Horace L. Cheyney for the petitioner.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry H. Seaton, It is ordered that William F. Weigester, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Randolph C. Shaw, It is ordered that Henry W. Longfellow, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William W. Dride, It is ordered that Walter R. Kuhn, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Quirk, It is ordered that Claude D. Cass, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward W. Shephard, It is ordered that Cyril A. Soans, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George E. Edelin, It is ordered that Michael B. Wagenheim, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counseller of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elton L. Marshall, It is ordered that Ray Weightman, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Randolph C. Shaw, It is ordered that J. Bertram Wegman, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Riley J. Wilson, It is ordered that Yandell Boatner, Esquire, of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert P. Reeder, It is ordered that Henry I. Eager, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, It is ordered that David W. Cannon, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis F. Glenn, It is ordered that Joseph E. Daily, Esquire, of Peoria, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. Frailey, It is ordered that Phil W. Davis, Jr., Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Crosser, It is ordered that Milton Sylvester Koblitz, Esquire, of Cleveland Heights, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond J. MacMinney, It is ordered that Leo J. Linder, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,

66 vs.

The United States of America, ex rel. The Vindicator Consolidated Gold Mining Company;

Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior, Petitioner,

67 vs.

The United States of America, ex rel. Chestatee Pyrites Chemical Corporation.

On consideration of the motion for the immediate issuance of the mandates in these causes,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Marine Transit Corporation, etc., Petitioner,
172 vs.
Louis Louis Dreyfus, et al., etc.,

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Horace L. Cheyney for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. George V. A. McCloskey for the respondents.

Herbert S. Daniel, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
179 vs.
Guaranty Trust Company of New York.

This case was argued by Mr. Winthrop B. Lane for the petitioner, and by Mr. Porter R. Chandler for the respondent.

Baltimore and Philadelphia Steamboat Company, et al., Petitioners,
185 vs.
Augustas P. Horton, Deputy Commissioner, etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Ira A. Campbell and Mr. Edwin A. Swingle for the petitioner. No appearance for the respondents.

Jesse H. Denton, Petitioner,
242 vs.
Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. John P. Bramhall for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. D. Minor for the respondent.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1931

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Hickey, It is ordered that Walter W. Ahrens, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that Paul P. Stoutenburgh, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. White, Jr., It is ordered that Cam D. Dorsey, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Silverstein, It is ordered that Seymour J. Koff, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl C. Michener, It is ordered that William P. Smith, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick L. Pierce, It is ordered that Paul R. Russell, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Mickey, It is ordered that Theodore L. Reimel, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard K. Stevens, It is ordered that John Lawrence Seymour, Esquire, of Wilmington, State of Delaware, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Iowa-Des Moines National Bank,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

15 vs. Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

E. R. Bennett, Chairman of the Board of

Supervisors of Polk County, Iowa, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Central State Bank,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

16 vs. Supreme Court of the

E. R. Bennett, Chairman of the Board of State of Iowa.

Supervisors of Polk County, Iowa, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Nellie Field Burwell, Sole Devisee and

Executrix of Samuel B. Field and

Joseph S. Pruitt, Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Court of Appeals

112 vs. of the State of Virginia.

James T. Powell and John S. Daisy.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Yale Oil Corporation of South Dakota,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court

159 vs. of the State of Montana.

The State of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Montana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, On a certificate from the United States

163 vs. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth

Leonard Vanbiervliet. Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. H. Averill, As Insurance Commissioner

of the State of Oregon, Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of

165 vs. the United States for the District

Northwestern National Insurance Company of Oregon.

of Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court granting an interlocutory injunction in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs and without prejudice to further consideration of the merits of the cause, and without prejudice to the power and duty of the District Court, as specially constituted, to inquire and determine whether the court has jurisdiction, both in relation to the amount involved in the controversy and with respect to the right of the complainant to maintain this suit in equity.

C. M. Saunders,

Appellant,

472 vs.

The State of Georgia.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Claiborne-Annapolis Ferry Company,

Appellant,

454 vs.

The United States of America, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New State Ice Company,

Appellant,

463 vs.

Ernest A. Liebmann.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. L. Mathews, et al.,

Appellants,

84 vs.

J. F. Rodgers, et al.

ORDER.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket and assigned for Monday, January 11th next, at the head of the call, for reargument, limited to the question of the jurisdiction of the District Court both with respect to the amount involved in the suit and the jurisdiction of the court as a court of equity.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William J. Stratton, as Secretary of State, etc., Appellant,
178 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company.

It is ordered by the Court that this cause be, and the same is hereby, restored to the docket and assigned for Monday, January 11th next, immediately following No. 84, Mathews v. Rodgers, for re-argument, limited to the question of the jurisdiction of the District Court both with respect to the amount involved in the suit and the jurisdiction of the court as a court of equity.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
The City of New York.

Upon consideration of the statements of Edward K. Campbell, Special Master, filed with the Clerk herein, the Court fixes his compensation at $6,500.00 and allows the expenses incurred by him, $739.84, all to be taxed as costs in the cause and to be paid by the defendant as provided in the decree of this Court entered December 7, 1931.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States, Petitioner,
505 vs.
The People of the State of New York, by James A. Beha, Superintendent of Insurance, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Howard Sutherland, as Alien Property Custodian of the United States, Petitioner,
505 vs.
The People of the State of New York, by James A. Beha, Superintendent of Insurance, etc.

On consideration of the motion of Herman F. M. Mutzenbecher, et al., to continue on their own behalf the petition for certiorari filed in the name of the Alien Property Custodian,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Irene Elizabeth Capron and Irene Elizabeth Capron, as Administratrix, Petitioner,

496 vs.

Erwin Ray Van Horn.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Anna L. Siegel and St. Louis Union Trust Company, Executors of Alfred J. Siegel, Petitioners,

502 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New Era Motors, Inc., et al., Petitioners,

510 vs.

Carl W. Burst, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Navigazione Libera Triestina and
Steamship "Carso," etc.,
Petitioners,
515 vs.
Molinelli, Giannusa & Rao, Inc.,
Cottone Bros., Inc., Thomas
Pepitone, Inc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Navigazione Libera Triestina and
Steamship "Carso," etc.,
Petitioners,
516 vs.
R. Gerber & Company, J. S. Hoffman
Company, Antonio Morici & Company,
et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Navigazione Libera Triestina and
Steamship "Carso," etc.,
Petitioners,
517 vs.
Italian Importing Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Navigazione Libera Triestina and Steamship "Carso," etc., Petitioners,
518 vs.
Western Sausage & Provision Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Navigazione Libera Triestina and Steamship "Carso," etc., Petitioners,
519 vs.
Robert Kurtz and Max Kurtz, Co-partners, doing business as Kurtz Brothers.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Champlin Refining Company, Appellant,
485 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.;
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al., Appellants,
486 vs.
Champlin Refining Company.

The motion to advance these cases was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry O. Glasser for the Champlin Refining Company.

Carolina & Northwestern Railway Company,

Appellant,

250 vs.

F. J. Key.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the appellant has filed a motion to dismiss the appeal in this cause,

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Owners' Automobile Insurance Company of New Orleans,

Appellant,

462 vs.

Sam Mathews Lawrason.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hugh M. Wilkinson for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Wylie M. Barrow for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Public Service Commission of Montana, et al., etc.,

Appellants,

471 vs.

Great Northern Utilities Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. A. Foot and Mr. Francis A. Silver for the appellants.

J. Earl Jardine,

Appellant,

482 vs.

Superior Court of the State of California, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. W. O'Melveny, Mr. Walter K. Tuller, and Mr. Irving M. Walker for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Leslie R. Hewitt, Mr. Aloysius I. McCormick, and Mr. Guy Richards Crump for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Ira M. Petersime & Son, etc., Petitioner,
520 vs.
John L. Robbins, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. A. Toulmin, Mr. H. A. Toulmin, Jr., and Mr. Melville Church for the petitioner, and by Mr. Raymond Ives Blakeslee for the respondent.

Southern Lumber Company, Petitioner,
523 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas S. Buzbee for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Norman D. Keller, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Leonard J. Woodruff, Petitioner,
524 vs.
Hubert F. Laugharn, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. A. Coleman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hugh L. Dickson for the respondent.

Drainage District No. 17 of Mississippi County, Arkansas, et al., Petitioners,
532 vs.
The Guardian Trust Company, as Trustee, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles T. Coleman for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles D. Frierson for the respondents.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas E. Turpin, It is ordered that Jacob M. Zinaman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that Michael Magle, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Guider, It is ordered that Frederick A. Keck, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas J. Freeman, It is ordered that Harry H. Russell, Esquire, of Monroe, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Burnita Shelton Matthews, It is ordered that Laura Maria Berrien, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

Transit Commission and State of New York, et al., etc., Appellants,
498 vs.
The United States of America, The Long Island Railroad Company, and The Interstate Commerce Commission.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Arizona Grocery Company,
Petitioner,
98 vs.
The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Arizona.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis.

American Hide and Leather Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

62 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court, and without prejudice to any restatement of the amount of overpayment based on a recomputation of the tax.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Matson Navigation Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

137 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, but without prejudice to an application by the petitioner to the court below, if so advised, for leave to amend the petition.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The Hodge Drive-It-Yourself Company, The
Barrs Self Driver Company, Inc., and
Burken Drive-It-Yourself, Inc., Appellants, vs. The City of Cincinnati, Russell Wilson, Clarence Dykstra, et al., etc. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

63

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Southern Railway Company, Appellant, vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky. — Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

300

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, Appellant, vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky. 301

Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Chicago & Eastern Illinois R. R. Co., Petitioner, vs. Industrial Commission of Illinois and Joe Thomas. 79

On writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Cook County, State of Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Circuit Court of Cook County, State of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Circuit Court of Cook County, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Harry Blockburger,

Petitioner,

374 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Jesse H. Denton,

Petitioner,

242 vs.

Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad Company, The Illinois Central Railroad Company, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

First National Bank of Boston, Executor
of the Estate of Edward H. Haskell,
Deceased, Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Judicial
171 vs. Court of the State of Maine.
State of Maine.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Judicial Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Maine for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Stone in which Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis concur.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,
Louisville and Nashville Railroad
Company, and Charleston & Western
Carolina Railway Company, Appellants, Appeal from the District Court
88 vs. of the United States for the
The United States of America, Inter- Western District of South Carolina.
state Commerce Commission, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in t is cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Edgar Percy Lewis and Richard F. Cooper,
as Trustees Under the Will of Arthur
Francis Thomas Cooper, Deceased,
Petitioners,
115 vs.
Marshall S. Reynolds, Individually and
as Collector of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Wyoming.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad
Company and the Atchison, Topeka and
Santa Fe Railway Company,
Petitioners,
130 vs.
Ben Terte, Judge of the Circuit Court
of Jackson County, Missouri, at
Kansas City.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

United States of America ex rel.
Aspasia Polymeris and Antigone
Polymeris, Petitioners, On writ of certiorari to the United
162 vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for
Joseph W. Trudell, Immigration the Second Circuit.
Inspector in Charge.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Vermont.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe
Railway Company, et al.,
Appellants, Appeal from the District Court of
287 vs. the United States for the Northern
The United States of America, The District of Illinois.
Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the orders of the said District Court refusing an interlocutory injunction in the causes, be, and the same are hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to grant the injunctions as prayed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Marine Transit Corporation and Tug "Gerald A. Fagan," by Marine Transit Corporation, Claimant,

Petitioner,

172 vs.

Louis Louis Dreyfus and Charles Louis Dreyfus, etc.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Owners' Automobile Insurance Company of New Orleans,

Appellant,

462 vs.

Sam Mathews Lawrason.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. Earl Jardine,

Appellant,

482 vs.

Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of Los Angeles, and Honorable Clair S. Tappaan.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Champlin Refining Company,

Appellant,

485 vs.

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.;

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al., Appellants,

486 vs.

Champlin Refining Company.

On consideration of the motion to advance these cases,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Public Service Commission of Montana, et al., etc.,

Appellants,

471 vs.

Great Northern Utilities Company.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Amox Shriver,

Appellant,

158 vs.

Woodbine Savings Bank of Woodbine, Iowa.

O R D E R.

This case is restored to the docket with the request that it be argued orally and the case is assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 23rd next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

85 vs. to the Court of Claims.

Olympia Shipping Corporation.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ira M. Petersime & Son, etc.,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

520 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

John L. Robbins, Trading as Robbins of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

Incubator Manufacturing Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Lumber Company, On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court

523 vs. of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Leonard J. Woodruff,

Petitioner,

524 vs. On petition for writ of certiorari

Hubert F. Laugharn, as Trustee in to the United States Circuit Court

Bankruptcy of the Estate of Golden of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

State Gem Company, Bankrupt.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Drainage District No. 17 of Mississippi

County, Arkansas, et al.,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

532 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

The Guardian Trust Company, as of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Trustee, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order:

O R D E R.

It is ordered by this Court that the bond of the Marshal, Frank K. Green, dated January 1, 1932, be, and the same is, this day approved and recorded.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Which said bond is in the words and figures following, viz:

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: That Frank K. Green, of Washington, District of Columbia, as Principal, and The Fidelity and Casualty Company of New York, as Surety, are held and firmly bound unto the United States of America in the penal sum of Twenty Thousand Dollars ($20,000.00), lawful money of the United States to be paid to the said United States, or their certain attorney, which payment well and truly to be made, we bind ourselves, our and each of our heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals and dated this first day of January, 1932.

WHEREAS, the above bounden Frank K. Green, hath been appointed Marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States;

NOW, THEREFORE, the condition of the above obligation is such that if the said Frank K. Green shall faithfully discharge the duties of his said office, and shall well and faithfully keep, disburse, pay over and account for according to law, the moneys that may come into his hands as such Marshal aforesaid, then this obligation to be void, otherwise to remain in full force and virtue in law.

WITNESSES:

(Sgd.) Thos. E. Waggaman

(Sgd.) E. C. Carusi.

(sgd.) Frank K. Green (Seal)

The Fidelity and Casualty Company of New York (Seal)

By (sgd.) George A. Griffin

George A. Griffin Attorney

The within and foregoing bond is hereby approved as to form, the sufficiency of the amount thereof and the sufficiency of the Surety thereon.

(sgd.) Charles E. Hughes

Chief Justice of the United States.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Leonard L. Pearson. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

611

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the appeal in this cause and have the mandate issued forthwith;

Therefor in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. Swift & Company, et al. — The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the appellant.

568

American Wholesale Grocers Association, et al., Appellants, vs. Swift & Company, et al. — The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the appellants.

569

National Wholesale Grocers Association, Appellant, vs. Swift & Company, et al. — The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank K. Nebeker for the appellant.

570

The State of Ohio, Petitioner, vs. The Chattanooga Boiler and Tank Company, a Tennessee Corporation, Chattanooga, Tennessee. — The motion for leave to file declaration and agreed statement of facts was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gilbert Bettman for the petitioner.

—, Original.

Genevieve Welosky,
Petitioner,
564 vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On motion made to the Court by Madge Lee Guard, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the National Woman's Party, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Genevieve Welosky,
Petitioner,
564 vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On motion made to the Court by Laura M. Berrien, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the National Association of Women Lawyers, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

—, Original.
Ex Parte: Michael P. Kosolapov,
Petitioner,

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Borris M. Komar for the petitioner.

The State of Wisconsin, et al.,
Complainants,
5, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.;
The State of Michigan, et al.,
Complainants,
8, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.;
The State of New York, et al., Complainants,
9, Original. vs.
The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.

The report of Sanitary District of Chicago, dated January 1, 1932, was presented to the Court.

Mrs. Iris Christine Bergholm, et al., Petitioners,

297 vs.

Peoria Life Insurance Company of Peoria, Illinois.

The motion to dismiss the case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Elliott and Mr. J. B. Wolfenbarger for the respondent in support of the motion, and by Mr. Tom Connally for the petitioners in opposition thereto.

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company, Appellant,

333 vs.

O. L. Bunn, doing business as Bunn Electric Company, et al.

The motion to dismiss or affirm this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. T. Kennedy, Mr. Gerald Brandon, Mr. E. H. Ratcliff, Mr. Marcellus Green, Mr. Joseph E. Brown, and Mr. Garner W. Green for the appellees in support of the motion, and by Mr. W. Calvin Wells, Mr. Arthur G. Powell, and Mr. Max F. Goldstein for the appellants in opposition thereto.

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company, Appellant,

333 vs.

O. L. Bunn, doing business as Bunn Electric Company, et al.

The motion of the Aetna Casualty & Surety Company to be made a party appellant was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. Calvin Wells, Mr. Arthur G. Powell, and Mr. Max F. Goldstein for the appellant in support of the motion, and by Mr. Marcellus Green and Mr. Garner W. Green for the appellee in opposition thereto.

American Surety Company of New York, Petitioner,

494 vs.

Vivian F. Baldwin and E. R. Baldwin.

The motion to dismiss this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James F. Ailshie for the respondents in support of the motion, and by Mr. Allan C. Rowe and Mr. Wm. Marshall Bullitt for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

537 vs.

Peavy-Wilson Lumber Company;

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

538 vs.

Peavy-Moore Lumber Company;

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

539 vs.

Peavy-Byrnes Lumber Company.

The motion by the respondent that the Court consider certain proceedings before the Board of Tax Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. L. Herold and Mr. John B. Files for the respondents in support of the motion, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner in opposition thereto.

New York Title and Mortgage Company, Appellant,

475 vs.

W. A. Tarver, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. A. Ritchie, and Mr. Nathan L. Miller for the appellants.

Champlin Refining Company, Appellant,

485 vs.

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.;

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al., Appellants,

486 vs.

Champlin Refining Company.

The statements as to jurisdiction herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Ramsey, Mr. Harry O. Glasser, Mr. H. G. McKeever, and Mr. Edgar O. DeMeules for the appellant in No. 485, and by Mr. J. Berry King, Mr. E. S. Ratliff, and Mr. W. P. Z. German for the appellants in No. 486.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
513 vs.
O. B. Limehouse.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the appellant.

The United States of America, Appellant,
568 vs.
Swift & Company, et al.;
American Wholesale Grocers Association, et al., Appellants,
569 vs.
Swift & Company, et al.;
National Wholesale Grocers Association, Appellants,
570 vs.
Swift & Company, et al.

The statements as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, and Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellant in No. 568; by Mr. Edgar Watkins, Mr. Mac Asbill, and Mr. Edgar Watkins, Jr., for the appellants, in No. 569; and by Mr. William C. Breed for the appellant in No. 570.

American Surety Company of New York,
Petitioner,
494 vs.
Vivian F. Baldwin and E. R. Baldwin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allan C. Rowe and Mr. Wm. Marshall Bullitt for the petitioner, and by Mr. James F. Ailshie for the respondents.

American Trading Company, Petitioner,
506 vs.
H. E. Heacock Co.;
Wm. A. Rogers, Ltd., and American Trading Company, Petitioners,
507 vs.
H. E. Heacock Co.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry D. Nims, Mr. James J. Kennedy, Mr. Wm. Cattron Rigby, and Mr. Minturn DeS. Verdi for the petitioners, and by Mr. John P. Bartlett and Mr. Edward S. Rogers for the respondent.

Ira Jewell Williams, Petitioner,
527 vs.
J. S. MacLaughlin, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Pennsylvania.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Peirce Coombes, Petitioner,
528 vs.
Milton E. Getz.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Douglass and Mr. Nat Schmulowitz for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar Lawler and Mr. Alfred Sutro for the respondent.

Addie Carlson and Columbia Casualty Company, Petitioner,
533 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oliver Dibble for the petitioners, and by Mr. George C. Faulkner for the respondents.

Addie Carlson and Columbia Casualty Company, Petitioners,
534 vs.
Industrial Accident Commission and Manuel Gomez.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oliver Dibble for the petitioners, and by Mr. George C. Faulkner for the respondents.

Norman Klauder, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc., Petitioner,
535 vs.
Flora E. Smyth, Assignee of Louis A. Shalet.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. D. Arthur Magaziner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Russell Duane for the respondent.

Jonas & Neuburger, Petitioner,
536 vs.
General Motors Acceptance Corporation, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis S. Posner and Mr. David Haar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Albert M. Levert and Mr. John Thomas Smith for the respondents.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
537 vs.
Peavy-Wilson Lumber Company;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
538 vs.
Peavy-Moore Lumber Company;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
539 vs.
Peavy-Byrnes Lumber Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. L. Herold, and Mr. John B. Files for the respondents.

Max Swarttz, et al., etc., Petitioners,
540 vs.
Benjamin F. Miller.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Julius C. Levi and Mr. Robert T. McCracken for the petitioners, and by Mr. Frank S. Busser for the respondent.

Knut Knutsen, a Citizen of Norway, Claimant, etc., Petitioner,
541 vs.
Associated Oil Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Richard Kelly and Mr. Ira S. Lillick, for the petitioner, and by Mr. S. Hasket Derby for the respondent.

Argonaut Consolidated Mining Company, Petitioner,
543 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, as Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Thomas Smith and Mr. Anthony J. Russo for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. John H. McEvers, Carlton Fox, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Ruby Lee Minar and Ruby Lee Minar, Incorporated, Petitioners,
544 vs.
Bertha H. Hammett;
Ruby Lee Minar and Ruby Lee Minar, Incorporated, Petitioners,
545 vs.
Bertha H. Hammett.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John S. Barbour for the petitioners, and by Mr. Julius I. Peyser and Mr. Milton Strasburger for the respondents.

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit
549 vs.	was submitted to the consideration of
Ruth J. Henkel, as Administratrix, etc.	the Court by Mr. Ray M. Van Doren and Mr. William T. Faricy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Mortimer H. Boutelle for the respondent.

Frances-Ralph Realty Company, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit
551 vs.	Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit
The United States of America.	was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. L. London for the

petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

United Drug Company, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit
552 vs.	Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit
Ireland Candy Company and National Equipment Company.	was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Brenton K. Fisk and Mr. Delos G. Haynes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward C. Taylor for the respondent.

Independent School District No. 18, of Lake Park, Minnesota, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit
554 vs.	was submitted to the consideration of
American Surety Company of New York.	the Court by Mr. C. A. Fosnes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas C. Daggett for the respondent.

Atlanta and Charlotte Air Line Railway Company, et al., Petitioners, vs. Verna Cato, Administratrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. F. G. Tompkins, and Mr. L. E. Jeffries for the petitioners, and by Mr. Sam J. Nicholls and Mr. C. C. Wyche for the respondent.
555	
Walter W. De Lapp and Mrs. Walter W. De Lapp, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest S. Cary for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher and Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the respondent.
556	
Genevieve Welosky, Petitioner, vs. Commonwealth of Massachusetts.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph Bearak for the petitioner.
564	
First National Bank and Trust Company in Macon, Petitioner, vs. Stevens, Ordinary.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clifford L. Anderson, Mr. John A. Hynds, Mr. Hughes Spalding, and Mr. John Sibley for the petitioner.
565	

O. C. Adams, J. A. Alexander, and others, former Stockholders, etc., et al., Petitioners,

571 vs.

Keystone Credit Corporation, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. Walton Moore, Mr. John S. Barbour, Mr. Robert H. McNeill, Mr. A. W. Patterson, and Mr. M. J. Fulton for the petitioners, and by Mr. Hartwell Cabell and Mr. John S. Eggleston for the respondents.

Patrick J. Hurley, et al., Petitioners,

457 vs.

R. Foster Kincaid, Sr.

Three and one-half hours were allowed for the oral argument of this case. The argument was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioners.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Harr, It is ordered that H. Clay Espey, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. S. M. Breckenridge Long, It is ordered that Neil P. Cullom, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Carter, It is ordered that Augustin Donovan, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Carter, It is ordered that Earl Warren, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George N. Murdock, It is ordered that Eugene T. McIlvaine, Esquire, of Jacksonville, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Riley J. Wilson, It is ordered that Winston K. Joffrion, Esquire, of Marksville, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Atlee Pomerene, It is ordered that Jos. A. Bayer, Esquire, of Mansfield, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Gordon Battle, It is ordered that E. D. Millikin, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Patrick J. Hurley, et al., Petitioners,
457 vs.
R. Foster Kincaid, Sr.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioners, by Mr. H. H. Russell and Mr. William C. Dufour for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner.

Harry M. Blackmer, Petitioner,
200 vs.
The United States of America;
Harry M. Blackmer, Petitioner,
201 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Karl C. Schuyler for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Atlee Pomerene for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

Harry M. Blackmer, Petitioner,
200 vs.
The United States of America;
Harry M. Blackmer, Petitioner,
201 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Atlee Pomerene for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. George Gordon Battle for the petitioner.

William Stevens,
Petitioner,
217 vs.
The Vessel "White City," her engines, tackles, apparel, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Neil P. Cullom for the petitioner, and by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the respondent.

Mrs. George G. Snowden, et al.,
Petitioners,
248 vs.
Red River and Bayon Des Glaises Levee and Drainage District of Louisiana, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Winston K. Joffrion for the petitioners, and was submitted by Mr. W. E. Covillian for the respondents.

Peter H. Miller, Individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Florida,

Petitioner,

251 vs.

The Standard Nut Margarine Company of Florida;

Josiah T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Georgia,

Petitioner,

252 vs.

The Standard Nut Margarine Company of Florida.

These cases were argued by Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the petitioners, and by Mr. George H. Murdock and Mr. E. H. McIlvaine for the respondent.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Arthur D. Klang, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that Carl C. Donaugh, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that Hattie L. Hinenberg, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leo P. Harlow, It is ordered that Winfield P. Jones, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. U. Bon Ceaslin, It is ordered that Clarence A. Powell, Esquire, of Jefferson City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry F. Ashurst, It is ordered that Hartwell H. Linney, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Central Pacific Railway Company and Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioners,
258 vs.
County of Alameda, et al., etc.

This case was argued by Mr. C. F. R. Ogilby for the petitioners, and by Mr. Earl Warren for the respondents.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
263 vs.
Clarence Bezue.

This case was argued by Mr. Edward R. Brumley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill for the respondent.

L. A. Nixon,
Petitioner,
265 vs.
James Condon and C. H. Kolle.

This case was argued by Mr. James Marshall for the petitioner. No appearance for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 1932.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David P. Wolhaupter, It is ordered that William J. Guste, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene C. Brokmeyer, It is ordered that Philip C. Friese, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Northcutt Ely, It is ordered that Leon Thomas David, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Walter F. Woodul, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that S. A. L. Morgan, Esquire, of Amarillo, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roland Boynton, It is ordered that Robert Oliver Mason, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl G. Bachmann, It is ordered that James M. Guiher, Esquire, of Clarksburg, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Pacific Company, Ltd.,
Appellant,
270 vs.
Charles G. Johnson, State Treasurer of the State of California.

This case was argued by Mr. Stuart Chevalier for the appellant, and by Mr. H. H. Linney for the appellee.

Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company,
Petitioner,
291 vs.
Mack Saxon, Ancillary Administrator, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. A. H. Culwell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Winbourn Pearce for the respondent.

United States Navigation Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
296 vs.
The Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd., et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Mark W. Maclay for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Oliver Wendell Holmes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter Schaffner, It is ordered that George H. Rummens, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry P. Adair, It is ordered that Carl T. Hoffman, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry J. Balzer, It is ordered that Joseph A. McLaughlin, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Barrett Carter, It is ordered that John A. Mobley, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Blaine Mallan, It is ordered that Lester T. Parker, Esquire, of Olympia, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Sutherland, It is ordered that Joseph B. Brennan, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry P. Adair, It is ordered that Daniel H. Redfearn, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William A. Sutherland, It is ordered that John Andy Smith, Esquire, of Talbotton, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry W. Anderson, It is ordered that Henry K. Gibson, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Baltimore and Philadelphia Steamboat Company and Maryland Casualty Company, Petitioners,	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.
185 vs.	This cause came on to be heard on the
Augustus P. Norton, Deputy Commissioner for Third Compensation District of the United States, and Emil Bruno Gube.	transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

James Dunn,

Petitioner,

393 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California.

Per Mr. Justice Holmes.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Butler.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

Mrs. George G. Snowden, et al.,

Petitioners,

248 vs.

Red River and Bayou Des Glaises Levee and Drainage District of Louisiana, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced:

In view of the large number of such orders, the other orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements, and upon applications for writs of certiorari, as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the Clerk of the Court.

The State of Ohio,
Plaintiff,
—, Original. vs.
Chattanooga Boiler & Tank Company.

On consideration of the motion of the State of Ohio for leave to file a petition in this Court in the above entitled cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. And it appearing that the Chattanooga Boiler & Tank Company has waived the issue and service of summons herein and has voluntarily entered its appearance as defendant in this Court in this cause, it is ordered that the said defendant have twenty days from this date within which to plead.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.
Ex Parte:
Michael P. Kosolapov, Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Wisconsin, et al., Complainants,

5, Original. vs.

The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.;

The State of Michigan, et al., Complainants,

8, Original. vs.

The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.;

The State of New York, et al., Complainants,

9, Original. vs.

The State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago, et al.

O R D E R.

The semi-annual report of the defendant Sanitary District of Chicago, dated January 1, 1932, is received and ordered to be filed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Iris Christine Bergholm, et al., Petitioners,

297 vs.

Peoria Life Insurance Company of Peoria, Illinois.

O R D E R.

Further consideration of the motion to dismiss the ~~appeal~~ writ of certiorari in this case is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company, Appellant,

333 vs.

O. L. Bunn, doing business as Bunn Electric Company, et al.

O R D E R.

Further consideration of the motion to dismiss or affirm and of the motion of the aetna Casualty & Surety Company to be made a party appellant is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Appellant,

513 vs.

O. B. Limehouse.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 23 next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Appellant,

568 vs.

Swift & Company, et al.;

American Wholesale Grocers Association, et al., Appellants,

569 vs.

Swift & Company, et al.;

National Wholesale Grocers Association, Appellant,

570 vs.

Swift & Company, et al.

In these cases probable jurisdiction is noted. The motions to advance are granted and the cases are assigned for argument on Monday, February 29 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New York Title and Mortgage Company, Appellant,

475 vs.

W. A. Tarver.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Champlin Refining Company, Appellant,

485 vs.

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.;

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al., Appellants,

486 vs.

Champlin Refining Company.

In these cases probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Surety Company of New York, Petitioner,

494 vs.

Vivian F. Baldwin and E. R. Baldwin.

It is ordered by the Court that action upon the petition for writ of certiorari in the above entitled cause be, and the same is hereby, withheld awaiting the action of the Supreme Court of Idaho in the matters pending before it.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Peirce Coombes,
Petitioner,
528 vs.
Milton E. Getz.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Tuesday, February 23rd next after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Trading Company,
Petitioner,
506 vs.
H. E. Heacock Co.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wm. A. Rogers, Ltd., and American Trading Company,
Petitioners,
507 vs.
H. E. Heacock Co.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Peavy-Wilson Lumber Company.

537

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Peavy-Moore Lumber Company.

538

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Peavy-Byrnes Lumber Company.

539

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

537 vs.

Peavy-Wilson Lumber Company;

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

538 vs.

Peavy-Moore Lumber Company;

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

539 vs.

Peavy-Byrnes Lumber Company.

On consideration of the motion of respondents requesting consideration of certain proceedings before the Board of Tax Appeals subsequent to the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ira Jewell Williams,

Petitioner,

527 vs. On petition for writ of certiorari

J. S. MacLaughlin, Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Pennsylvania. to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Addie Carlson and Columbia Casualty Company, Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

533 vs. to the Supreme Court of the

Industrial Accident Commission, Belle Cecilia Rodgers and Belle Agnes Rodgers. State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and

Addie Carlson and Columbia Casualty Company,

Petitioners,

534 vs.

Industrial Accident Commission and Manuel Gomez.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Norman Klauder, Trustee in Bankruptcy for Michael A. Leibowitz, et al., etc.,

Petitioners,

535 vs.

Flora E. Smyth, Assignee of Louis A. Shalet.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jonas & Neuburger,

Petitioner,

536 vs.

General Motors Acceptance Corporation, Edwin S. Updike, et al., as Trustees, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Max Swarttz, Morris Swarttz and Milton Swarttz, Trading as M. Swarttz & Sons, Petitioners,

540 vs.

Benjamin F. Miller.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Knut Knutsen, a Citizen of Norway, Claimant of the Steamship "Golden Gate," her tackle, apparel and furniture, Petitioner,

541 vs.

Associated Oil Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Argonaut Consolidated Mining Company, Petitioner,

543 vs.

Charles W. Anderson, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ruby Lee Minar and Ruby Lee Minar Incorporated, Petitioners, vs. Bertha H. Hammett.

544 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ruby Lee Minar and Ruby Lee Minar, Incorporated, Petitioners, vs. Bertha H. Hammett.

545 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Ruth J. Henkel, as Administratrix and Personal Representative of the Estate of Carl E. P. Henkel, Deceased.

549 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frances-Ralph Realty Company,
Petitioner,
551 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United Drug Company,
Petitioner,
552 vs.
Ireland Candy Company and National Equipment Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Independent School District No. 18 of Lake Park, Minnesota,
Petitioner,
554 vs.
American Surety Company of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Atlanta and Charlotte Air Line Railway
Company and Southern Railway Company,
Petitioners,
555 vs.
Verna Cato, Administratrix of the
Estate of O. C. Cato, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Walter W. DeLapp and Mrs. Walter W.
DeLapp,
Petitioners,
556 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Genevieve Welosky,
Petitioner,
564 vs.
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Superior Court of Suffolk County, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

First National Bank and Trust Company in Macon, Petitioner,

565 vs.

Stevens, Ordinary.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

O. C. Adams, J. A. Alexander and Others, Former Stockholders, etc., et al., Petitioners,

571 vs.

Keystone Credit Corporation, Royal Indemnity Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fox Film Corporation, Appellant,

118 vs.

Paul H. Doyal, State Tax Commissioner.

The abolishment of the office of State Tax Commissioner of Georgia and the creation of the State Revenue Commission in lieu thereof, and the appointment of Paul H. Doyal, R. E. Matheson, and William B. Harrison, as members of said Commission, having been suggested,

It is, on motion of Mr. W. A. Sutherland, ordered by the Court that Paul H. Doyal, R. E. Matheson, and William B. Harrison, Members of the State Revenue Commission, be substituted as the parties appellees in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.
Ex Parte: Rebecca Silverman,
Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Lewis for the petitioner.

Joseph E. Illick, et al.,
Petitioners,
—, vs.
Trust Company of Florida, et al.

The motion for leave to file an abbreviated record as an exhibit to the petition for writ of certiorari to be filed herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry W. Anderson for the petitioners, in support of the motion, and by Mr. Cary D. Landis, Mr. Carl T. Hoffman, Mr. Henry P. Adair, Mr. Mitchell B. Price, and Mr. R. D. Redfearn for the respondents, in opposition thereto.

United Drug Company,
Appellant,
324 vs.
Frank P. Washburn, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Maine.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Henry S. Manley, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the People of the State of New York and The Department of Agriculture and Markets as amici curiae, in this cause.

The Excess Insurance Company of America,
Petitioner,
573 vs.
Charles J. Connor and James P. Connor, Co-Partners, Doing Business as Thomas Connor & Sons.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

It appearing to the Court that a motion of counsel for the petitioner to dismiss the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause has been filed;

Therefore in pursuance of said motion, it is ordered by the Court that the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alvah W. Estabrook,
Petitioner,
625 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alvah W. Estabrook pro se.

Walter H. Gant, et al.,
Appellants,
449 vs.
City of Oklahoma City, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. H. Everest for the appellants.

Eastern Air Transport, Inc.,
Appellant,
504 vs.
South Carolina Tax Commission, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. H. White, Jr., and Mr. Christie Benet for the appellant.

R. H. Cousins,
Appellant,
511 vs.
Sovereign Camp, Woodmen of the World.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John D. Cofer for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Charles L. Black for the appellee, in opposition thereto.

Vincent J. Gianatasio,
Appellant,
512 vs.
Abraham Kaplan, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gopal Mintz for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Arthur J. W. Hilly, Mr. J. Joseph Lilly, and Mr. Frederick A. Keck for the appellees, in opposition thereto.

Kansas City Public Service Company,
Appellant,
521 vs.
John R. Ranson, as Collector, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert W. Otto, Mr. Henry N. Ess, and Mr. Powell C. Groner for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Henry L. McCune and Mr. E. H. Wright for

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company,
Appellant,
525 vs.
F. E. McPherson, Administrator of
Willie Gant, Deceased.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. M. Robinson for the appellant.

Thomas K. Glenn,
Appellant,
526 vs.
Paul H. Doyal, State Tax Commissioner.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Sibley, Mr. Marion Smith, and Mr. Herman H. Swift for the appellant.

Morris Levinson,
Petitioner,
558 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Halle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Trinity Methodist Church, South,
Petitioner,
559 vs.
Federal Radio Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis G. Caldwell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Charles H. Weston, Mr. W. Marvin Smith, and Mr. Thad H. Brown for the respondent.

Lucy C. Taylor, Administratrix, etc.,
Petitioner,
572 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Curry for the petitioner, and by Mr. Geo. E. Walker, Mr. Thomas B. Gay, and Mr. Wirt P. Marks, Jr. for the respondent.

O. K. Jelks & Son,
Petitioners,
577 vs.
Tom Huston Peanut Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Wenwick and Mr. William D. Jones, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. Lewis Stackpole for the respondent.

Pioneer Cooperage Company,
Petitioner,
579 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stanley S. Waite for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Norman D. Keller, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

United States Navigation Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
296 vs.
The Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd., et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Mark W. Maclay for the petitioner.

W. L. Mathews, et al.,
Appellants,
84 vs.
J. F. Rodgers, et al.

This case was reargued by Mr. J. A. Lauderdale for the appellants, and by Mr. Edward W. Smith for the appellees.

William J. Stratton, as Secretary of State of the State of Illinois,
Appellant,
178 vs.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company.

This case was reargued by Mr. Bayard Lacey Catron for the appellant and by Mr. Josiah Whitnel for the appellee.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., It is ordered that Earle A. Merrill, Esquire, of Westfield, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Hinton Holloway, It is ordered that P. Michael Cook, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Stafford, It is ordered that Walter F. Mayer, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
311 vs.
Sophia C. Bachmann.

This case was argued by Mr. James M. Guiher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles J. Schuck and Mr. Carl G. Bachmann for the respondent.

Fox Film Corporation,
Appellant,
118 vs.
Paul H. Doyal, et al., etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Joseph B. Brennan for the appellant, continued by Mr. Orville A. Park for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. W. A. Sutherland for the appellant.

Realty Acceptance Corporation,
Petitioner,
314 vs.
Henry C. Montgomery.

This case was argued by Mr. R. Randolph Hicks for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas J. Crawford for the respondent.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles L. McNary, It is ordered that David Robinson, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles W. Steiger, It is ordered that Earl H. Hatcher, Esquire, of Topeka, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

It is ordered by this Court that the accompanying correspondence between members of the Court and Mr. Justice Holmes, upon his retirement as an Associate Justice of the Court, be this day spread upon the record, and that it also be printed in the reports of the Court.

Supreme Court of the United States,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1932.

Dear Justice Holmes:

We can not permit your long association in the work of the Court to end without expressing our keen sense of loss and our warm affection. Your judicial service of over forty-nine years - twenty years in the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts and twenty-nine years upon this bench - has a unique distinction in uninterrupted effectiveness and exceptional quality. Your profound learning and philosophic outlook have found expression in opinions which have become classic, enriching the literature of the law as well as its substance. With a most conscientious exactness in the performance of every duty, you have brought to our collaboration in difficult tasks a personal charm and a freedom and independence of spirit which have been a constant refreshment. While we are losing the privilege of daily companionship, the most precious memories of your unfailing kindliness and generous nature abide with us, and these memories will ever be one of the choicest traditions of the Court.

Deeply regretting the necessity for your retirement, we trust that - relieved of the burden which had become too heavy - you may have a renewal of vigor and that you may find satisfaction in your abundant resources of intellectual enjoyment.

Affectionately yours,

Charles E. Hughes,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,

Mr. Justice Holmes.

Supreme Court of the United States,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1932.

My Dear Brethren:

You must let me call you so once more. Your more than kind, your generous, letter touches me to the bottom of my heart. The long and intimate association with men who so command my respect and admiration could not but fix my affection as well. For such little time as may be left for me I shall treasure it as adding gold to the sunset.

Affectionately yours,

O. W. Holmes,

The Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

A. O. Arneson and His Wife Mary Arneson, et al., Appellants,
319 vs.
United Irrigation Company, etc., et al.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. S. J. Brooks that Mr. J. Q. Henry be given leave to appear and present oral argument, pro hac vice, for the appellees in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. O. Arneson, and His Wife Mary Arneson, et al., Appellants,
319 vs.
United Irrigation Company, etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. S. J. Brooks for the appellants, and by Mr. J. A. Mobley and Mr. J. Q. Henry, pro hac vice, by special leave of Court, for the appellees.

United Drug Company, Appellant, vs. Frank P. Washburn, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Maine.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Brenton H. Fisk for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.
324	
T. Irving Potter and C. E. Bahr, Appellants, vs. Charles R. Maybury, as Director of Licenses of the State of Washington, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. C. H. Rummens for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.
325	
J. Howard Leman, Administrator, etc., et al. Petitioners, vs. Krentler-Arnold Hinge Last Company.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Ellis Spear, Jr., for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Robert Cushman for the respondent.
332	

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Garner W. Green, It is ordered that S. B. Laub, Esquire, of Natchez, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Soterios Nicholson, It is ordered that Harris J. Booras, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Gilmer Korner, It is ordered that George W. Newgass, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Gilmer Korner, It is ordered that Joseph J. Klein, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Garner W. Green, It is ordered that Gerard H. Brandon, Esquire, of Natchez, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Emanuel Celler, It is ordered that Benjamin L. Stein, Esquire, of Paterson, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Soterios Nicholson, It is ordered that Cleon R. Nixon, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis F. Glenn, It is ordered that Jacob I. Grossman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kenneth McKellar, It is ordered that James N. Hardin, Esquire, of Greenville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Garner W. Green, It is ordered that L. Barrett Jones, Esquire, of Jackson, State of Mississippi, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Ruth Hastings, of Stamford, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Emil L. Klett, Esquire, of Lubbock, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Carl Runge, Esquire, of Mason, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that J. I. Kilpatrick, Esquire, of Lubbock, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

J. Howard Leman, Administrator, etc., et al.,
Petitioners,
332 vs.
Krentler-Arnold Hinge Last Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Robert Cushman for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Ellis Spear, Jr., for the petitioner.

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company,
Appellant,
333 vs.
O. L. Bunn, Doing Business as Bunn Electric Company, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Marion Smith for the appellant; continued by Mr. Gerard H. Brandon for appellees Bunn, et al.; by Mr. S. B. Laub for appellees, Natchez Investment Company, et al.; by Mr. Garner W. Green for appellees, Enochs Lumber & Manufacturing Company, et al.; and concluded by Mr. L. Barrett Jones for the appellant.

Western Distributing Company, Appellant, 337 vs. The Public Service Commission of the State of Kansas, et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Robert D. Garver for the appellant; and by Mr. E. H. Hatcher for the appellees.
Dahlstrom Metallic Door Company, et al., Appellants, 338 vs. Industrial Board of the State of New York.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Robert H. Jackson for the appellants.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Thomas Taylor, It is ordered that Allan T. Gilbert, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Thomas Taylor, It is ordered that William D. Saltiel, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James C. Rogers, It is ordered that George Sanford Parsons, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that Harry W. Forbes, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins, It is ordered that Frederick Ewin Youngman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
341 vs.
Coronado Oil and Gas Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. J. Berry King, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Oklahoma, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Dahlstrom Metallic Door Company, et al.,
Appellants,
338 vs.
Industrial Board of the State of New York.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Walter F. Dodd, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Wisconsin, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Dahlstrom Metallic Door Company, et al.,
Appellants,
338 vs.
Industrial Board of the State of New York.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Robert H. Jackson for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
341 vs.
Coronado Oil and Gas Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas P. Gore and Mr. David A. Richardson for the respondent.

United States Cartridge Company,
Petitioner,
348 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Harry LeBaron Sampson for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. McInnis, It is ordered that John Murdoch MacGregor, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George P. Parker, It is ordered that Byron D. Anderson, Esquire, of Salt Lake City, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Samuel Jacob Kaufman, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Louis K. Press, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William D. Harris, It is ordered that Joseph Zemel, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley Reed, It is ordered that Russell B. Becker, Esquire, of Ashland, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh Satterlee, It is ordered that I. Herman Sher, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles G. Baldwin, It is ordered that J. Howard Payne, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Hess, It is ordered that Louis J. Schneider, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Hess, It is ordered that Robert N. Gorman, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Hess, It is ordered that Dudley Miller Outcalt, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leslie A. Welch, It is ordered that Clarence A. Randolph, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Heartsill Ragon, It is ordered that Cecil R. Warner, Esquire, of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Crosser, It is ordered that Leonard M. Blum, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

A. O. Arneson and His Wife, Mary Arneson; Fred Guerin, et al.,	Appellants,	Appeal from the Court of Civil Appeals, Fourth Supreme Judicial
319 vs.		District, State of Texas.
United Irrigation Company, etc., et al.		

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Civil Appeals, Fourth Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United Drug Company,

Appellant,

324 vs.

Frank P. Washburn, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Maine.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maine.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Maine, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court denying an interlocutory injunction in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

T. Irving Potter and G. E. Bahr,

Appellants,

325 vs.

Charles R. Maybury, as Director of Licenses of the State of Washington; Ewing D. Colvin, as Prosecuting Attorney, etc., et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dahlstrom Metallic Door Company and Jamestown Mutual Insurance Company,

Appellants,

338 vs.

Industrial Board of the State of New York.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

L. A. Nixon,

Petitioner,

265 vs.

James Condon and C. H. Kolle.

The application of the respondents for leave to file a brief herein, notwithstanding the expiration of the time allowed therefor, is granted, and the case is restored to the docket for reargument at a date hereafter to be fixed by the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced:

In view of the large number of such orders, the other orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements, and upon applications for writs of certiorari, as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the Clerk of the Court.

Walter H. Gant, Knox L. Garvin and A. D. Hudspeth,

Appellants,

449 vs.

City of Oklahoma City, a Municipal Corporation and J. W. Van Meter, Superintendent of Buildings.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

R. H. Cousins,

Appellant,

511 vs.

Sovereign Camp, Woodmen of the World.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Vincent J. Cianatasio,

Appellant,

512 vs.

Abraham Kaplan, Ferdinand Q. Morton and John J. Keller, etc., et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

--- Original.

Ex Parte: Rebecca Silverman,

Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph E. Illick, et al.,
Petitioners,
No. — vs.
Trust Company of Florida, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file an abbreviated record as an exhibit to the petition for writ of certiorari to be filed in this cause, It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alvah W. Estabrook,
Petitioner,
625 vs.
F. G. Zerbst, Warden, etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause, It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that the costs already incurred herein shall be paid by the Clerk from the special fund in his custody, as provided in the order of October 29, 1926.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alvah W. Estabrook,
Petitioner,
625 vs.
F. G. Zerbst, Warden, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John Borum, John Logan and Milton Guy,
550 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further herein in forma pauperis and of the motion to bring up the entire record and cause,

It is ordered by this Court that the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that the motion to bring up the entire record and cause be, and the same is hereby, denied.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, assigned for argument on Friday, January 22 next, at the head of the call for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Eastern Air Transport, Inc.,
Appellant,
504 vs.
South Carolina Tax Commission, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Kansas City Public Service Company,
Appellant,
521 vs.
John R. Ranson, as Collector, etc.

Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this cause is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company,
Appellant,
525 vs.
F. E. McPherson, Administrator of
Willie Cant, Deceased.

Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this cause is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thomas K. Glenn,
Appellant,
526 vs.
Paul H. Doyal, State Tax Commissioner.

Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this cause is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Clarence W. Haggerty, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 460

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Morris Levinson, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 558

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Trinity Methodist Church, South, Petitioner, vs. Federal Radio Commission. 559

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lucy C. Taylor, Administratrix of
H. H. Taylor, Deceased,
Petitioner,
572 vs.
Southern Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals, of the State of Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

O. K. Jelks & Son,
Petitioners,
577 vs.
Tom Huston Peanut Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pioneer Cooperage Company,
Petitioner,
579 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

ORDER.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, January 25, until Monday, February 15, next.

United States on relation of Wilbur F. Stuart, Petitioner,
588 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for leave to file the brief of respondent on or before Friday next,
It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chili Fish, et al., etc., Petitioners,
583 vs.
Walter Wise, et al., etc.

On consideration of the motion to defer the consideration of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause for one week,
It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ellison Ranching Company, Appellant,
522 vs.
George A. Bartlett.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. D. Skeen for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. A. G. Mashburn and Mr. M. A. Diskin for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Dayton C. Thomson, et al., Appellants, vs. Marshall N. Dana, et al., etc.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. Y. Masters for the appellants.
529	
Girard Trust Company, as Trustee under the last will and testament of Charles I. Cragin, deceased, Appellant, vs. Ocean & Lake Realty Company.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Wideman for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. William W. Miller and Mr. Francis P. Fleming for the appellee in opposition thereto.
530	
Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen, etc., et al., Appellants, vs. The State of Ohio, ex rel. J. Charles Bowman.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Melvin C. Light, Mr. James J. Weadock, Mr. Ernest M. Botkin, and Mr. H. E. Garling for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. U. G. Denman and Mr. William H. Harris for the appellee in opposition thereto.
553	
Ogden & Moffett Company, et al., Appellants, vs. Michigan Public Utilities Commission, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Percy J. Donovan for the appellants.
557	
S. B. Lawrence, et al., Appellants, vs. State Tax Commission of the State of Mississippi.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Watkins for the appellants.
580	

Mary S. Trotter, Petitioner, 561 vs. Iantha C. Anderson; Mary S. Trotter, Petitioner, 562 vs. John Russell Anderson, et al; Mary S. Trotter, Petitioner, 563 vs. Baylis Estate Company.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Sea, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. John L. McNab for the respondent.
North American Oil Consolidated, Petitioner, 575 vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert W. Clark for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Miss Helen R. Carloss, and Mr. Francis M. Horan for the respondent.
John T. Callahan, Petitioner, 576 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Halle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.
George J. Adams and A. W. Kitchen, Co-partners, etc., Petitioners, 581 vs. Andrew W. Mellon, Director General, etc., et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clair R. Hillyer for the petitioners, and by Mr. Silas H. Strawn, Mr. Ralph M. Shaw, Mr. Frank H. Towner, Mr. Sidney F. Andrews, and Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the respondents.

Woolford Realty Company, Inc., Petitioner,
582 vs.
J. T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by W. A. Sutherland and Mr. Joseph B. Brennan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John H. McEvers, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Chili Fish, et al., etc., Petitioners,
583 vs.
Walter Wise, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Boudinot, Mr. Robert L. Owen, Mr. D. H. Linebaugh, and Mr. Henry G. Thomas for the petitioners, and by Mr. James A. Veasey and Mr. Lloyd G. Owen for the respondents.

Joyce Ethel Peters, Administratrix, etc., Petitioner,
584 vs.
Wabash Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Allen for the petitioner, and by Mr. N. S. Brown, Mr. W. M. Woodward, and Mr. Homer Hall for the respondent.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, Petitioner,
585 vs.
James M. Borum.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry S. Mitchell and Mr. John E. Palmer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Tom Davis and Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondent.

Henri Charpentier,
Petitioner,
586 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold L. Turk for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Paul D. Miller for the respondent.

J. P. Stevens Engraving Company,
Petitioner,
587 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. A. Sutherland and Mr. Joseph B. Brennan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Norman D. Keller, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

United States on relation of Wilbur F. Stuart,
Petitioner,
588 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chester I. Long, Mr. Peter Q. Nyce, Mr. Grace McDonald Phillips, and Mr. Samuel W. McIntosh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Claude R. Branch and Mr. Paul D. Miller, for the respondent.

Herman C. Hagner and Julia C. Hagner,
Petitioners,
590 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. J. Hughes, Jr., Mr. Lucian H. Vandoren, and Mr. Wm. E. Leahy for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher and Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the respondent.

George A. Greible, Petitioner,
591 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Houts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Keziah Reed, et al., Petitioners,
600 vs.
Lorenzo Allen.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Wilmer Latimer, Mr. Walter C. Clephane, and Mr. Gilbert L. Hall for the petitioners, and by Mr. Alvin L. Newmyer and Mr. George C. Gertman for the respondent.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
605 vs.
W. F. Miller, Administrator of Cruce Miller, deceased, and W. F. Miller.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward J. White and Mr. Thomas B. Pryor for the petitioner, and by Mr. David S. Partain for the respondent.

Old Colony Railroad Company, Petitioner,
349 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

This case was argued by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.

Mrs. Iris Christine Bergholm, et al., Petitioners,
297 vs.
Peoria Life Insurance Company of Peoria, Illinois.

This case was argued by Mr. E. L. Klett for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. I. Kilpatrick for the respondent.

Frank Collis Bowers, as Executor, etc., Petitioner,

355 vs.

Lawyers Mortgage Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Harry W. Forbes for the respondent.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard C. Stoll, It is ordered that James Park, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Alexis Green, It is ordered that Lloyd D. Martin, Esquire, of St. Petersburg, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Luther A. Johnson, It is ordered that Ralph F. Lozier, Esquire, of Carrollton, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl Richard Chindblom, It is ordered that Justus F. Mozart, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elmer Thomas, It is ordered that A. G. C. Bierer, Jr., Esquire, of Guthrie, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert J. Bulkley, It is ordered that Gardner Abbott, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. King, It is ordered that William H. Reeder, Jr., Esquire, of Ogden, State of Utah, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

George J. Adams and A. W. Kitchen, Co-partners, etc., Petitioners,
581 vs.
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General, etc., et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Edward M. Reidy in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Frank Collis Bowers, as Executor, etc., Petitioner,
355 vs.
Lawyers Mortgage Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Harry W. Forbes for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
356 vs.
Home Title Insurance Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hugh Satterlee for the respondent.

The State of Utah and Independent Coal & Coke Company, Petitioners, 42 vs. The United States of America; Carbon County Land Company, Petitioner, 48 vs. The United States of America.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William J. Donovan for petitioner State of Utah; continued by Mr. Mahlon E. Wilson for petitioner Independent Coal & Coke Company; by Mr. Samuel A. King for petitioner, Carbon County Land Company; and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ray W. Nedrow, It is ordered that Henry F. Schepman, Esquire, of Falls City, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The State of Utah and Independent Coal & Coke Company, Petitioners,
42 vs.
The United States of America;
Carbon County Land Company, Petitioner,
48 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Samuel A. King for petitioner, Carbon County Land Company.

The Packer Corporation, Appellant,
357 vs.
The State of Utah.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Gardner Abbott for the appellant, continued by Mr. Byron S. Anderson and Mr. George P. Parker for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. W. H. Reeder, Jr., for the appellant.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,	This case was argued by Mr. Leslie A.
365 vs.	Welch for the petitioner, and by Mr.
Sophia David, Administratrix, etc.	A. C. Randolph for the respondent.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,	The argument of this case was commenced
378 vs.	by Mr. Assistant Attorney General
Chicago Portrait Company.	Youngquist for the petitioner.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Magee, It is ordered that Edmund W. Arthur, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clement L. Bouvé, It is ordered that Benjamin P. Merrick, Esquire, of Grand Rapids, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William P. Wendell, It is ordered that Harry May, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leo C. Weiler, It is ordered that Herbert G. Kraft, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

American Hide and Leather Company,
Petitioner,
62 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion by counsel for the petitioner to have the mandate in this cause issued forthwith, It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
378 vs.
Chicago Portrait Company.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, by Mr. Arnold R. Baar for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner.

Ruth J. Henkel, as Administratrix, etc.,
387 vs.
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & & Omaha Railway Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Everett Sanders for Henkel, Administratrix, and by Mr. William T. Faricy for the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omah Railway Company.

T. Binford, et al.,
Appellants,
391 vs.
J. H. McLeaish & Company, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Albert L. Reed for the appellant and continued by Mr. Lon E. Blankenbecker and Mr. John H. Crooker for the appellees, and by Mr. Elbert O. Hooper for the appellants.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 22, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. O'Shea, It is ordered that John H. Burnett, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James A. O'Shea, It is ordered that Alfred Goldstein, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that George Spencer Wright, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper, It is ordered that Burton H. White, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, It is ordered that M. H. Rosenhouse, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

T. Binford, et al., Appellants,
391 vs.
J. H. McLeaish & Company, et al.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Elbert O. Hooper for the appellants.

John Borum, John Logan, and Milton Guy,
550 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John H. Burnett for Borum, et al. The Court declined to hear further argument.

American Surety Company of New York, Petitioner,
401 vs.
The Greek Catholic Union.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Edmund W. Arthur for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Ralph C. Davis and Mr. Thomas Stephen Brown for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. James M. Magee for the petitioner.

Charley Singleton, et al., Petitioners,
403 vs.
Edith Creek, nee Jackson, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. A. G. C. Bierer, Jr., for the petitioners. No appearance for the respondents.

The Galveston Wharf Company, et al., Petitioners,
411 vs.
The Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Company, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George S. Wright for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper for the respondent, Mallory Steamship Company.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that W. Howard Demarest, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard S. Doyal, It is ordered that Arnold Just, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph W. Byrns, It is ordered that Charles Willett, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas E. Rhodes, It is ordered that Merton D. Morse, Esquire, of Schenectady, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that N. Malcolm Baldrige, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence M. Cake, It is ordered that Francis M. Goodwin, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Clarence Bezue. 263

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Putnam County.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Putnam County, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Putnam County, for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

T. Binford, et al.,

Appellants, Appeal from the District Court

391 vs. of the United States for the

J. H. McLeaish & Company, Nils Southern District of Texas.

Nelson, W. F. Mottier, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court granting an interlocutory injunction in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John Borum, John Logan, and Milton Guy, On a certificate from the Court of

550 vs. Appeals of the District of Columbia.

The United States of America.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said Court of Appeals, and that the mandate issue forthwith in said cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced:

In view of the large number of such orders, the other orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements, and upon applications for writs of certiorari, as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the Clerk of the Court.

Ellison Ranching Company,

Appellant,

522 vs.

George A. Bartlett.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nevada, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

In re Disbarment of George D. Collins, Sr.

ORDER.

It having been represented to the Court that George D. Collins, Senior, of San Francisco, California, has been disbarred from the practice of the law by the courts of the State of California,

Therefore, it is ordered by this Court that the said George D. Collins, Senior, be, and he is hereby, ordered to show cause within forty days from this date why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court, and his name stricken from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice here.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Hide and Leather Company,

Petitioner,

62 vs.

The United States.

ORDER.

The opinion in this cause is hereby amended by adding at the conclusion thereof the following paragraph:

"The amounts of the tax computed by the Commission and the amount of the overpayment as stated in this opinion are those shown by the findings of the Court of Claims, but the mandate of this Court will be without prejudice to any restatement of the amount of overpayment based on a recomputation of the tax."

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dayton C. Thomson, et al., Appellants, vs. Marshall N. Dana, et al., etc.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
529	
Ogden & Moffett Company, et al., Appellants, vs. Michigan Public Utilities Commission, et al.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
557	
S. B. Lawrence, et al., Appellants, vs. State Tax Commission of the State of Mississippi.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
580	
Gerard Trust Company, as Trustee, etc., Appellants, vs. Ocean & Lake Realty Company.	Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
530	
Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen, et al., Appellants, vs. The State of Ohio ex rel. J. Charles Bowman.	Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
553	

John T. Callahan, Petitioner,

576 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for argument on Monday, February 29, 1932, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Herman O. Hagner and Julia C. Hagner, Petitioners,

590 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted, and the case is assigned for argument on Monday, February 29, 1932, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

North American Oil Consolidated, Petitioner,

575 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George J. Adams and A. W. Kitchen, Co-partners, etc., Petitioners,

581 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads and Union Stock Yard & Transit Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Woolford Realty Company, Inc., Petitioner,

582 vs.

J. T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Georgia.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, Petitioner,

585 vs.

James M. Borum.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Keziah Reed, Georgiana R. Simpson, Lillian M. H. Redding, etc., et al., Petitioners,

600 vs.

Lorenzo Allen.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary S. Trotter, Petitioner,

561 vs.

Iantha C. Anderson.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary S. Trotter, Petitioner,

562 vs.

John Russel Anderson, William H. Anderson, Charles M. S. Anderson, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary S. Trotter, Petitioner,
563 vs.
Baylis Estate Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joyce Ethel Peters, Administratrix of the Estate of James Cornelius Peters, Deceased, Petitioner,
584 vs.
Wabash Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henri Charpentier, Petitioner,
586 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. P. Stevens Engraving Company,
Petitioner,
587 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States on relation of
Wilbur F. Stuart,
Petitioner,
588 vs.
Ray Lyman Wilbur, as Secretary of the Interior.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George A. Greible,
Petitioner,
591 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. W. F. Miller, Administrator of Cruce Miller, Deceased and W. F. Miller. On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

605

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

O R D E R.

The Clerk of this Court having reported to the Court the following list of twenty-five cases disposed of at prior terms and the amount of costs due and unpaid therein as shown by the Report of the annual audit of the Clerk's accounts:

October Term, 1921.

No. 657.	Bailey et al. vs. Drexel Furniture Co.	$18.50

October Term, 1923.

No. 126.	Packard vs. Banton, as District Attorney.	7.75

October Term, 1924.

No. 26.	The United States vs. City of Wellsville.	10.80
No. 35.	Miller, Alien Property Custodian vs. Robertson.	22.70
No. 75.	Flannagan v. Federal Coal Company.	8.55
No. 111.	The United States v. Johnston.	12.05
No. 145.	Robertson v. Miller, A. P. C.	2.60
No. 187.	Grayson v. Harris et al.	17.05

October Term, 1925.

No. 244.	Alabama & Vicksburg Ry. Co. v. Jackson & Eastern Ry. Co.	20.00
No. 786.	Transportes Maritimos Do Estado v. L. Mundet & Sons.	3.30

October Term, 1926.

No. 107.	Missouri Pacific Ry. Co. v. Porter.	9.60
No. 158.	Lowe v. Dickson.	18.75
No. 211.	Federal Trade Commission v. Klesner.	40.05

October Term, 1927.

No. 344.	Work, Secy of Interior v. Braffet, Admr.	$43.70

October Term, 1928.

No. 78.	The United States vs. Carver et al.	13.05
No. 116.	Grayson vs. Harris, et al.	16.35
No. 118.	Michigan Central R. R. Co. v. Mix et al.	6.10
No. 198.	Karnuth, Director of Immigration vs. U. S. ex rel. Cook.	35.65
No. 219.	Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. R. Co. vs. Koske.	11.55
No. 306.	Carson Petroleum Co. v. Vial et al.	10.40

October Term, 1929.

No. 303.	Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. vs. Toops.	11.05

October Term, 1930,

No. 25.	Wall et al. v. Bankers Life Company.	6.25
No. 600.	Atlantic Coast Line R. R. Co. v. Powe, Adm'r.	11.80
No. 874.	Dial v. The United States.	3.15

and the Clerk having represented to the Court that unsuccessful efforts have been made to collect the said costs;

It is ordered by this Court that the Clerk is authorized to charge off on his books costs which are deemed uncollectable in the amount of $368.35 due in the twenty-five cases listed herein. This order shall not affect the force and validity of the charges against the litigants in these cases, if collection hereafter in any case shall prove to be possible, and

It is further ordered that the Clerk is directed to continue efforts to collect costs due in the thirty-one remaining cases listed in the audit of his accounts, dated October 4, 1931.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

O R D E R.

It appearing to this Court from the Report of Ernst and Ernst, of its audit of the accounts of the Clerk of this Court, dated October 4, 1931, that certain checks drawn on the National Bank of Washington and issued by the Clerk, or his predecessors in office, dated January 19, 1914, to November 17, 1928, inclusive, have not been presented for payment by the several payees; and that unsuccessful efforts have been made by the Clerk to communicate with the payees, their heirs, assigns, administrators or successors;

On consideration whereof, it is ordered by this Court that the Clerk be, and he is hereby, directed to cancel and to instruct the bank to withhold payments upon forty-seven checks drawn on the National Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C., dated January 19, 1914, to November 17, 1928, inclusive, which said checks bear the following numbers: 112; 157; 1109; 1221; 3103; 3134; 3431; 3516; 3544; 3931; 4552; 5512; 5777; 5951; 5956; 6065; 6137; 6197; 6202; 6289; 6432; 6945; 6953; 7055; 7430; 7481; 7560; 7577; 8062; 8151; 8182; 8194; 8206; 8298; 8666; 8885; 9177; 9218; 9252; 9821; 9967; 10520; A-169; A-237; A-381; A-741; A-1492; and which in the aggregate amount to the sum of $325.53;

And it is ordered that the Clerk is directed to withdraw from deposit in the National Bank of Washington the sum of $325.53 and to transfer said sum of money to the credit of the Special Fund, established and maintained pursuant to the order of this Court dated October 10, 1921, in the Union Trust Company of Washington, D. C., to be there held subject to the further order or orders of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chili Fish, et al., etc., Petitioners,

583 vs.

Walter Wise, et al., etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the United States, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Southern Railway Company, Appellant,

300 vs.

Commonwealth of Kentucky;

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, Appellant,

301 vs.

Commonwealth of Kentucky.

On consideration of the motion by counsel for the appellants to stay the mandate in these causes for a period of 60 days,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edmund K. Fleming,

Petitioner,

604 vs.

Mabel G. Reinecke, United States Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

On consideration of the motion by counsel for the petitioner for leave to file a reply brief within one week in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alice Slattery, et al.,

Appellants,

609 vs.

Roual L. Cochran, et al.

On consideration of the motion to extend for a period of 15 days from January 30 the time within which to file the statement as to jurisdiction and statement of points to be relied upon and designation of parts of the record to be printed in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Elizabeth Stanton (Parmelee) et al., Petitioners,

508 vs.

T. L. Herbert & Sons, et al.;

Mrs. Elizabeth Stanton (Parmelee) et al., Petitioners,

509 vs.

T. L. Herbert & Sons, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee and the Court of Appeals of the State of Tennessee was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jordan Stokes, Jr., and Mr. Harvey D. Jacob for the petitioners, and by Mr. Thomas H. Malone and Mr. Charles C. Trabue for the respondents.

Continental Tie and Lumber Company, Petitioner,

560 vs.

The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. H. Goodner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. L. A. Smith, and Mr. Bradley B. Gilman for the respondent.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company and F. W. Loos, Petitioners,

589 vs.

Steve Sabol.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ray H. Van Doren, Mr. Samuel J. Cady, Mr. Nelson J. Wilcox, and Mr. Arthur H. Ryall for the petitioners, and by Mr. Joseph C. Fehr for the respondent.

Thomas D. Taylor, Petitioner,

592 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maurice Bower Saul for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. William Cutler Thompson, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Frank J. Dorger and Clarence A. Dorger, Petitioners, vs. The State of Ohio.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Smith W. Bennett for the petitioners, and by Mr. Louis J. Schneider, Mr. Dudley Miller Outcalt, and Mr. Robert N. Gorman for the respondents.
595	
People of the State of Michigan, by John S. Haggerty, Secretary of State, Petitioners, vs. Michigan Trust Company, Receiver, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul W. Voorhies for the petitioners, and by Mr. Benjamin P. Merrick for the respondent.
598	
Amdyco Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Radcliffe Morris Urquhart, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. Brown Morton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph D. Denny, Jr., and Mr. J. Claude Bedford for the respondents.
602	
Southern Pacific Company, Petitioner, vs. George Thomas.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, State of California, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. W. Durbrow, Mr. H. C. Booth, Mr. C. O. Ammonette, and Mr. W. I. Gilbert for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Thomas, pro se.
603	

Edmund K. Fleming,
Petitioner,
604 vs.
Mabel C. Reinecke, United States Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Kratz for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Carlton Fox, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Grace Elizabeth Everett, et al.,
Petitioners,
607 vs.
Amy Wing, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Vermont was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Wattawa for the petitioners, and by Mr. Warren R. Austin for the respondents.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
608 vs.
Michael Duplak, by his next friend, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Duane E. Minard and Mr. George S. Hobart for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick B. Scott for the respondent.

Bonwit Teller and Company,
Petitioner,
610 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur B. Hyman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. John Mac C. Hudson for the respondent.

Gratigny Plateau Development Corporation, et al., Petitioners, 612 vs. Arthur R. Hill, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roscoe C. McCulloch for the petitioners, and by Mr. A. S. Iddings and Mr. D. W. Iddings for the respondents.
Charles S. Quinzel, a Creditor, etc., Petitioner, 615 vs. Harry G. Hendricks, Trustee, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., and Mr. William E. Leahy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Eugene B. Sullivan and Mr. Samuel J. Kaufman for the respondents.
W. Yale Smiley, Petitioner, 617 vs. Mike Holm, as Secretary, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George T. Simpson and Mr. W. Yale Smiley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry N. Benson for the respondent.
The Texas & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, 634 vs. The United States.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Adrian C. Humphreys, Mr. Chester A. Gwinn, and Mr. Newton K. Fox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, and Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

The Galveston Wharf Company, et al., Petitioners,

411 vs.

The Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Company, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Roscoe H. Hupper, for the respondent, Mallory Steamship Company, and concluded by Mr. John P. Bullington for the respondent, Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio Railway Company, et al.

The Aetna Casualty and Surety Company, Petitioner,

413 vs.

Phoenix National Bank and Trust Company of Lexington.

This case was argued by Mr. Samuel M. Wilson for the petitioner and by Mr. James Park for the respondent.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin F. Evarts, It is ordered that David L. Mair, Esquire, of New Britain, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Benjamin F. Evarts, It is ordered that Jacob Richmond, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John E. Benton, It is ordered that Robert W. Upton, Esquire, of Concord, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Leahy, It is ordered that Stanley M. Burns, Esquire, of Dover, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that R. R. Farr, Esquire, of Fairfax, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that D. E. Coffman, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Andrew J. Montague, It is ordered that Edward T. Haynes, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that Lucius P. Chase, Esquire, of Kohler, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Leahy, It is ordered that George T. Hughes, Esquire, of Dover, State of New Hampshire, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Francis H. Horan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that Oliver J. Todd, Esquire, of Beaumont, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

W. L. Mathews, et al., Appellants, vs. J. F. Rodgers, et al. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Mississippi.

84

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

William J. Stratton, as Secretary of State of the State of Illinois, Appellant, vs. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois.

178

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Illinois, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

State of Utah and Independent Coal & Coke Company, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 42

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Carbon County Land Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 48

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Utah.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Peter H. Miller, Individually and as
Collector of Internal Revenue for
the District of Florida,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Standard Nut Margarine Company
of Florida.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

251

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, I t is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Stone in which Mr. Justice Brandeis concurs.

Josiah T. Rose, Collector of Internal
Revenue for the District of Georgia,
Petitioner,
vs.
The Standard Nut Margarine Company
of Florida.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

252

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Stone in which Mr. Justice Brandeis concurs.

United States Cartridge Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

348 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Central Pacific Railway Company and

Southern Pacific Company,

Petitioners, On writ of certiorari to the

258 vs. Supreme Court of the

County of Alameda, Chas. W. Heyer, State of California.

Ralph Richmond, et al., etc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

United States Navigation Company, Inc., On writ of certiorari to the United

Petitioner, States Circuit Court of Appeals for

296 vs. the Second Circuit.

The Cunard Steamship Company, Ltd., et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of

Mrs. Iris Christine Bergholm, et al.,

Petitioners, On writ of certiorari to the United

297 vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for

Peoria Life Insurance Company of the Fifth Circuit.

Peoria, Illinois.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Charley Singleton, Maggie Davis,

and George Davis,

Petitioners, On writ of certiorari to the

403 vs. Supreme Court of the

Edith Cheek, Née Jackson, Jewel State of Oklahoma.

Braziel, Née Jackson, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe
Railway Company, Petitioner,
291 vs. On writ of certiorari to the
Mack Saxon, Ancillary Administrator Supreme Court of the State of
and Personal Representative in Texas Texas.
of the Estate of J. W. Moore, Deceased.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Texas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Missouri Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the
365 vs. Supreme Court of the
Sophia David, Administratrix of the State of Missouri.
Estate of James Lee David, Deceased.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Realty Acceptance Corporation,
Petitioner,
314 vs.
Henry G. Montgomery.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the orders of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals entered in this cause on July 6, 1931, be, and the same are hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Old Colony Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
349 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

American Surety Company of New York, Petitioner, vs. The Greek Catholic Union. 401

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Pennsylvania for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Mr. Justice McReynolds is of opinion that the judgment should be affirmed.

Harry M. Blackmer, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 200

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration and decision of this cause.

Harry M. Blackmer, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 201

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration and decision of this cause.

Ruth J. Henkel, as Administratrix and Personal Representative of the Estate of Carl E. P. Henkel, Deceased, vs. Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Company. 387

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative.

Thereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. Howard Leman, Administrator C. T. A.
of The Estate of George E. Belcher
and George E. Belcher Company, Petitioners,
vs.
Krentler-Arnold Hinge Last Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

332

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed, except so far as it relates to the profits in question, and, in this respect, the decree of the said Circuit Court of Appeals modifying the decree of the District Court is reversed with costs and that of the District Court affirmed.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice McReynolds is of the opinion that the proceedings should have been dismissed for lack of jurisdiction over the respondent.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

The State of Ohio, Petitioner,
vs.
The Chattanooga Boiler and Tank Co.

ORDER.

18, Original.

Answer having been filed, the parties may, upon filing stipulation to that effect, waive the filing of replication and submit the case to the Court for its decision upon the pleadings and agreed statement of facts, with provision for oral argument before the Court, if that is desired.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice said:

"In view of the large number of orders of the Court they will not be announced orally but appear upon the list certified by the Chief Justice filed with the Clerk."

—

In re Disbarment of William E. Baff.

Upon consideration of the answer of the respondent, William E. Baff, to the rule of this Court issued to him November 2, 1931, to show cause why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court,

It is ordered that Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Reeve Lewis and Mr. Joseph H. Milans, all of Washington, District of Columbia, be, and they are hereby, appointed a Committee of the Bar of this Court to examine and report upon the following matters with respect to the order of March 18, 1921, disbarring the respondent from practice in the United States Patent Office upon charges of his misconduct, viz:

(1) What were the charges of misconduct upon which the said order of disbarment was made?

(2) Was the proceeding for disbarment conducted upon due notice and with due hearing of the respondent or due opportunity on his part to be heard?

(3) What were the findings, if any, in that proceeding in relation to the respondent's misconduct?

(4) What proceedings were had subsequent to the order of March 18, 1921, either in court or in the United States Patent Office, with respect to the said order of disbarment, including any proceedings for the respondent's reinstatement? What was the result of any such proceedings?

And to submit its recommendation as to the final action of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edgar Percy Lewis and Richard F. Cooper, as Trustees, etc., Petitioners,
115 vs.
Marshall S. Reynolds, individually and as Collector of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

ORDER.

In this cause it is ordered that the following words be deleted from the sixth paragraph, page two, of the opinion announced on January 4th, 1932 -

"Also that at the time of his last decision he was restricted to consideration of the demand for refund and determination of whether the trustees were entitled to deduct the State inheritance taxes".

Otherwise the opinion will stand as heretofore announced.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Pacific Co., Ltd., Appellant,
270 vs.
Charles G. Johnson, State Treasurer of the State of California.

ORDER.

It is ordered that this case be restored to the docket for reargument on a date to be fixed hereafter by the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Continental Tie and Lumber Company, Petitioner,
560 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

People of the State of Michigan, by John S. Haggerty, Secretary of State, Petitioners,

598 vs.

Michigan Trust Company, Receiver of Worden Grocer Company.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,

608 vs.

Michael Duplak, by his next friend, Steve Duplak and Steve Duplak and Annie Duplak, individually.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. Yale Smiley, Petitioner,

617 vs.

Mike Holm, as Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Texas and Pacific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
634 vs.
The United States.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted, and the case is assigned for argument immediately following the hearing of case No. 560, Continental Tie and Lumber Company vs. The United States.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chili Fish, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
583 vs.
Walter Wise, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Elizabeth Stanton (Parmelee), et al.,
Petitioners,
508 vs.
T. L. Herbert & Sons, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Elizabeth Stanton (Parmelee), et al., Petitioners, vs. T. L. Herbert & Sons, et al.

509

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago and North Western Railway Company and F. W. Loos, Petitioners, vs. Steve Sabol.

589

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thomas D. Taylor, Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

592

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank J. Dorger and Clarence A. Dorger,
Petitioners,
595 vs.
The State of Ohio.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Amdyco Corporation,
Petitioner,
602 vs.
Radcliffe Morris Urquhart and American Forom Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
603 vs.
George Thomas.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the District Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District, State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the District Court of Appeal, 1st Appellate District, State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edmund K. Fleming,

Petitioner,

604 vs.

Mabel G. Reinecke, United States Collector of Internal Revenue for the First District of Illinois.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Grace Elizabeth Everett and Sarah Everett (Pro Ami),

Petitioners,

607 vs.

Amy Wing, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Vermont.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Vermont, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bonwit Teller and Company,

Petitioner,

610 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gratigny Plateau Development Corporation,
John E. O'Donnell, Harry Orner, et al.,
Petitioners,
612 vs.
Arthur R. Hill, Joseph B. Cartmell,
George Cugley, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles S. Quinzel, a Creditor of
George E. Thomas, Bankrupt,
Petitioner,
615 vs.
Harry G. Hendricks, Trustee in
Bankruptcy of George E. Thomas,
Bankrupt and Joseph P. Day.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
694 vs.
George Otis Smith.

The joint motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in that behalf.

The United States of America,
694 vs.
George Otis Smith.

The joint motion to bring up the entire record and cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in that behalf.

The United States of America, 694 vs. George Otis Smith.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Attorney General of the United States and the Solicitor General of the United States as amici curiae, in this cause. Ruling on the motion for leave to participate in the oral argument will be subsequently announced.
Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, 689 vs. Harold K. Guinzburg, et al., etc.	The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. Stanley Hinrichs in behalf of counsel for the respondent.
L. J. Blakey, Receiver, etc., Petitioner, 639 vs. Charles J. Brinson.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. George P. Barse, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Comptroller of the Currency, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
Robert M. Leach, Executor, etc., Petitioner, 468 vs. Malcolm E. Nichols, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. Frederick Schwertner, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Clarence W. DeKnight, as amicus curiae, in this cause.
Claiborne-Annapolis Ferry Company, Appellant, 454 vs. The United States of America, et al.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. George E. Edelen, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Maryland, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Claiborne-Annapolis Ferry Company,
Appellant,
454 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

On consideration of the motion by counsel for the appellee, The Chesapeake Beach Railway Company, for leave to file brief in answer to the brief of the State of Maryland, as amicus curiae within ten days,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

— Original.

Ex parte: Gordon Dover, Petitioner,

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gordon Dover pro se.

Gulbang Malbantian,
Petitioner,
654 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward M. S. Martin for the petitioner.

South Carolina Power Company,
Appellant,
542 vs.
South Carolina Tax Commission, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. G. L. B. Rivers, Mr. Arthur R. Young, and Mr. M. Rutledge Rivers for the appellant.

R. A. Vose,
Appellant,
593 vs.
U. S. Cities Corporation.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. F. Wilson for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. James I. Phelps for the appellee in opposition thereto.

The Southwest Utility Ice Company, Appellant,
616 vs.
Ernest A. Liebmann.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. H. Everest and Mr. John B. Dudley for the appellant.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
594 vs.
Campbell River Mills Company, Ltd., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. M. Dudley and Mr. C. S. Jefferson for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. C. Brodie for the respondents.

Arkansas Power & Light Company, Petitioner,
596 vs.
West Memphis Power & Water Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. W. House and Mr. C. H. Moses for the petitioner.

Mike Chetkovich, Petitioner,
597 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John A. Shelton for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General St. Lewis, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. W. Clifton Stone, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Katie B. Thomas, Petitioner,
601 vs.
Archie C. McFall.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George B. Webster for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. C. Malloy for the respondent.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,
Petitioner,
606 vs.
Leong Dung Dye.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. C. Brandenburg and Mr. Louis M. Denit for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles B. Dwight for the respondent.

Des Moines Terminal Company,
Petitioner,
613 vs.
Des Moines Union Railway Company, et al.;
Chicago Great Western Railroad Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
614 vs.
Des Moines Union Railway Company, et al.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. G. Gamble and Mr. R. L. Reed for the petitioner in No. 613; by Mr. J. C. James and Mr. Donald Evans for the petitioner in No. 614; and by Mr. Homer Hall and Mr. John N. Hughes for the respondents.

Edmund D. Adcock,
Petitioner,
618 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Irvin H. Fathchild for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Miss Helen R. Carloss for the respondent.

Thomas A. Grigg,
Petitioner,
623 vs.
Tom Bolton, United States Marshal for the District of Montana, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. L. Maury for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Harry S. Ridgely for the respondent.

The United States,
Petitioner,
624 vs.
Bonwit Teller & Co.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Arthur B. Hyman for the respondent.

Wisconsin Coca Cola Bottling Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
626 vs.
E. L. Husting Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles F. Fawsett for the petitioners, and by Mr. William L. Tibbs for the respondent.

American Bond and Mortgage Company and Trianon, Inc.,
Petitioners,
628 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Homer H. Cooper and Mr. George W. Swain for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Charles H. Weston, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

William Lowenstein, as Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
629 vs.
Annie Reikes, et al.;
William Lowenstein, as Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
630 vs.
I. N. Platt & Co., Inc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob M. Zinaman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Seymour J. Koff and Mr. David W. Kahn for the respondents.

J. Z. Wright, R. C. Wiggins, et al., Petitioners,
632 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Felix E. Alley for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Aubrey Lawrence, and Mr. Nat M. Lacy for the respondent.

James A. Tillman, Petitioner,
633 vs.
Russo-Asiatic Bank.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Borris M. Komar for the petitioner, and by Mr. Maurice Leon for the respondent.

Frank L. Speakman, Ancillary Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
635 vs.
Thomas W. Bryan, as State Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Selden Bacon, Mr. Robert C. Alston, and Mr. Robert H. Richards for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. E. Norvell, Jr., Mr. S. H. Evins, and Mr. James H. Anderson for the respondent.

Thomas W. White, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
636 vs.
John L. Hall, et al., Executors.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company,
Petitioner,
637 vs.
C. M. Spencer.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Murray Allen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clyde A. Douglass and Mr. Robert N. Simms for the respondent.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
638 vs.
Richard W. Didsbury.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George S. Hobart for the petitioner, and by Mr. Thomas G. Haight and Mr. John A. Hartpence for the respondent.

L. J. Blakey, Receiver, etc.,
Petitioner,
639 vs.
Charles J. Brinson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George P. Barse for the petitioner.

L. E. Dulion, Doing Business as Mason & Dulion,
Petitioner,
640 vs.
S. A. Lynch Enterprise Finance Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Winfield P. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert C. Alston for the respondent.

Inez B. Crandall,
Petitioner,
641 vs.
William Habbe, Sheriff, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George T. Buckingham for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ashby M. Warren and Mr. John D. Welman for the respondent.

Glen E. Wolfe,
Petitioner,
648 vs.
The Prudential Insurance Company of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ralph F. Lozier for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry I. Eager and Mr. Charles M. Blackmar for the respondent.

Adams Grease Gun Corporation,
Petitioner,
649 vs.
The Bassick Manufacturing Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred W. Kiddle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Lynn A. Williams for the respondent.

F. G. Corker,
Petitioner,
651 vs.
W. K. Howard, as Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blair Foster for the petitioner.

Bankers Utilities Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
653 vs.
National Bank Supply Company, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roy L. Daily for the petitioners, and by Mr. C. P. Goepel, Mr. Charles E. Townsend, and Mr. William A. Loftus for the respondents.

Smith-Hamburg Scott Welding Co. of New York, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
662 vs.
Charles Henry Bickell, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Wilson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Dean S. Edmonds and Mr. William H. Davis for the respondent.

Robert W. Hurt and Elmer R. Hurt, Petitioners,
663 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Austin M. Cowan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles M. Blackmar, Mr. Henry I. Eager, Mr. Richard E. Bird, and Mr. Louis H. Cooke for the respondent.

Charles W. Anderson, Collector, etc., Petitioner,
689 vs.
Harold K. Guinzburg, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. James Marshall for the respondents.

Southern Pacific Company,
Petitioner,
339 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. Charles H. Bates for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

Bradford Electric Light Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
423 vs.
Jennie M. Clapper, Administratrix.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Stanley M. Burns for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Robert W. Upton for the respondent and by Mr. George T. Hughes for the petitioner.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward C. Lake, It is ordered that Walter F. Mehrlich, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy A. Fulcher, It is ordered that Campbell C. Cochran, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson T. Hartson, It is ordered that Paul M. Godehn, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. Russell Alden, It is ordered that Samuel B. Seidel, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Jesse P. Wolcott, Esquire, of Port Huron, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter R. Kuhn, It is ordered that George Washington Riley, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Robinson, It is ordered that Robert C. Knox, Esquire, of Eldorado, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James W. S. Peters, It is ordered that H. L. Jost, Esquire, of Kansas City, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marvin Jones, It is ordered that Ben M. Stone, Esquire, of Amarillo, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that T. S. Christopher, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Bradford Electric Light Company, Inc., Petitioner,
423 vs.
Jennie M. Clapper, Administratrix.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. George T. Hughes for the petitioner.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
426 vs.
Charles P. Leininger.

This case was argued by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Irwin M. Loeser for the respondent.

D. Ginsberg & Sons, Inc., Petitioner,
429 vs.
Joseph Popkin.

This case was argued by Mr. Leo J. Linder for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Jersawit for the respondent.

Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc., as Owner of the Motorboat "Linseed King," etc., Petitioner,
430 vs.
Hilda M. Hicks, Administratrix, etc., et al.;
Vera Alexander, Administratrix of the Estate of James Alexander, Deceased, et al., Petitioners,
444 vs.
Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. D. Roger Englar for Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc., and continued by Miss Elizabeth Robinson for Vera Alexander, Administratrix, etc.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lucius Q. C. Lamar, It is ordered that J. Forrest McCutcheon, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Fisher, It is ordered that Lloyd Church, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George B. Rose, It is ordered that Walter G. Riddick, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Harry M. Blackmer, Petitioner,
200 vs.
The United States of America;
Harry M. Blackmer, Petitioner,
201 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion by counsel for the petitioner to have the mandates in these causes issued forthwith, It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original,
Ex Parte: The State of Colorado, Petitioner,

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence L. Ireland for the petitioner.

Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc., as Owner of the Motorboat "Linseed King," etc., Petitioner,
430 vs.
Hilda M. Hicks, Administratrix, etc., Vera Alexander, Administratrix of the Estate of James Alexander, deceased, et al., Petitioners,
444 vs.
Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc.

The argument of these cases was continued by Miss Elizabeth Robinson for Vera Alexander, Administratrix, etc., et al.; by Mr. Lester Hand Jayne for Helen Roberts, as Administratrix, etc., et al.; and concluded by Mr. D. Roger Englar for Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc.

William E. Lamb, Petitioner,
432 vs.
Sterling B. Cramer, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. Edward B. Burling for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gerald Fitzgerald for the respondents.

William E. Lamb, Petitioner,
433 vs.
William A. Schmitt, Receiver, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Edward B. Burling for the petitioner, and by Mr. Gerald Fitzgerald and Mr. Sam C. Cook for the respondents.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

453 vs.

Hannah R. Temple, Administratrix, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Thomas W. Davis for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. John F. Williams for the respondent.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justices.
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence J. McLeod, It is ordered that Miss Zaio A. Woodford, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William Hayes Fuller, It is ordered that Guy L. Andrews, Esquire, of McAlester, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Sisson, It is ordered that Robert W. Byerly, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard S. Doyle, It is ordered that Abraham Lowenhaupt, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond J. Mawhinney, It is ordered that Ralph E. Slayton, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, It is ordered that George M. Nicholson, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson T. Hartson, It is ordered that Harry S. Mesirov, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer W. Hall, It is ordered that Carl Solomonson, Esquire, of Rockford, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, Petitioner,

453 vs.

Hannah R. Temple, Administratrix, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. John F. Williams and Mr. R. E. Whiting for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Douglas McKay for the petitioner.

Claiborne-Annapolis Ferry Company, Appellant,

454 vs.

The United States of America, The Interstate Commerce Commission and Chesapeake Beach Railway Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Philip B. Perlman for the appellant; continued by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellees, The United States and the Interstate Commerce Commission; by Mr. Jonathan C. Gibson for the appellee, Chesapeake Beach Railway Company; and concluded by Mr. Jesse I. Miller for the appellant.

Franklin-American Trust Company,
Petitioner,

455 vs.

St. Louis Union Trust Company, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George B. Rose for the petitioner.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1932 -

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justices.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harold M. Wilson, It is ordered that David B. Newsom, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Seymour H. Person, It is ordered that Harry G. Gault, Esquire, of Flint, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George F. Brumm, It is ordered that Jacob Klensin, Esquire, of Carbondale, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that R. Gaynor Wellings, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Addison T. Smith, It is ordered that Ben L. Fairchild, Esquire, of Pelham, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

George L. Shearer, Petitioner, 469 vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue; William A. W. Stewart, Petitioner, 470 vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. R. Gaynor Wellings, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Burton E. Eames and others as amici curiae, in this cause.
Franklin-American Trust Company, Petitioner, 455 vs. St. Louis Union Trust Company, et al.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. George B. Rose for the petitioner, by Mr. Walter C. Riddick, for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Henry Davis for the respondents.
New State Ice Company, Appellant, 463 vs. Ernest A. Liebmann.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John B. Dudley for the appellant, continued by Mr. George M. Nicholson for the appellee, and concluded by Mr. Guy L. Andrews for the appellant.
The United States of America, Petitioner, 466 vs. Daniel M. Lefkowitz and Pauline Paris.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner and continued by Mr. David P. Siegel for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry A. Schweinhart, It is ordered that Mrs. Frances Cash-Sosin, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry A. Schweinhart, It is ordered that Maxwell Sosin, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Freer, It is ordered that Mary B. Linkins, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George Sanford Parsons, It is ordered that Harold Lee, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert J. Delange, It is ordered that Ireland Graves, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl G. Bachman, It is ordered that M. C. Hammond, Esquire, of Welch, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas E. Lodge, It is ordered that Michael J. J. Watman, Esquire, of Lynn, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George O. Compton, It is ordered that Ignatius K. Werwinski, Esquire, of South Bend, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. O. Walker Taylor, It is ordered that Everett S. White, Esquire, of Taunton, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis F. Glenn, It is ordered that Frederick C. Oien, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis F. Glenn, It is ordered that Nat S. Ruvell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry A. Schweinhart, It is ordered that B. G. Carson, Esquire, of Washington, District

Patrick J. Hurley, et al., Petitioners, vs. R. Foster Kincaid, Sr. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

457

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana with direction to dismiss the bill without prejudice.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The Packer Corporation, Appellant, vs. The State of Utah. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah.

357

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Utah, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Sophia C. Bachmann.

311 On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of West Virginia for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Chicago Portrait Company.

378 On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Letus M. Crowell, as Deputy Commissioner for the Seventh Compensation District of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, Petitioner, vs. Charles Benson. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

19

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Brandeis, in which Mr. Justice Stone and Mr. Justice Roberts concur.

Letus M. Crowell, as Deputy Commissioner for the Seventh Compensation District of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and J. B. Knudsen, Petitioners, vs. Charles Benson. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

20

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Alabama.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Brandeis, in which Mr. Justice Stone

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

R. A. Vose,

Appellant,

593 vs.

U. S. Cities Corporation.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

R. A. Vose,

Appellant,

593 vs.

U. S. Cities Corporation.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gulbang Malbantian,

Petitioner,

654 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gulbang Malbantian, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

654

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice said:

In view of the large number of such orders, the other orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements, and upon applications for writs of certiorari as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the Clerk of the Court.

— Original.

Ex parte: The State of Colorado, Petitioner,

O R D E R.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is ordered by the Court that a rule issue requiring the respondent to show cause on or before March 14th next why leave to file the petition for writ of mandamus should not be granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
694 vs.
George Otis Smith.

On consideration of the joint motion to bring up the entire record and cause and the joint motion to advance this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, granted, and the case is assigned for argument on Monday, March 21 next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the motion of the Attorney General and Solicitor General of the United States for leave to participate in the oral argument of this case be granted as prayed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John T. Callahan, Petitioner,
576 vs.
The United States of America;
Herman O. Hagner and Julia C. Hagner, Petitioners,
590 vs.
The United States of America;
Amos Shriver, Petitioner,
158 vs.
Woodbine Savings Bank of Woodbine, Iowa.

O R D E R.

It is ordered that these cases be reassigned for argument on Monday, March 14 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

L. A. Nixon,
Petitioner,
265 vs.
James Condon and C. H. Kolle.

O R D E R.

It is ordered that this case be assigned for reargument on Monday, March 14 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fox Film Corporation, Appellant,

118 vs.

Paul H. Doyal, State Tax Commissioner;

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

341 vs.

Coronado Oil and Gas Company.

O R D E R.

It is ordered that these cases be restored to the docket and assigned for reargument on Monday, March 14 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Pacific Company, Ltd., Appellant,

270 vs.

Charles G. Johnson, State Treasurer of the State of California.

ORDER.

It is ordered that this case be assigned for reargument on Monday, March 14 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Appellant,

568 vs.

Swift & Company, et al.

American Wholesale Grocers Association, et al., Appellants,

569 vs.

Swift & Company, et al.

National Wholesale Grocers Association, Appellant,

570 vs.

Swift & Company, et al.

O R D E R.

It is ordered that these cases be reassigned for argument on Monday, March 14 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Peirce Coombes,
Petitioner,
528 vs.
Milton H. Getz.

ORDER.

It is ordered that this case be reassigned for argument on Monday, March 21 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Champlin Refining Company, Appellant,
485 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.;
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al., Appellants,
486 vs.
Champlin Refining Company.
Champlin Refining Company, Appellant,
122 vs.
Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al., etc.

ORDER.

It is ordered that these cases be reassigned for argument on Wednesday, March 23 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

South Carolina Power Company,
Appellant,
542 vs.
South Carolina Tax Commission, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Southwest Utility Ice Company,
Appellant,
616 vs.
Ernest A. Liebmann.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Adams Grease Gun Corporation,
Petitioner,
649 vs.
The Bassick Manufacturing Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

L. J. Blakey (Successor to R. E. Schumacher), Receiver of the First National Bank of New Bern, New Bern, North Carolina, Petitioner,
639 vs.
Charles J. Brinson.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
594 vs.
Campbell River Mills Company, Ltd., Thomsen & Clark Timber Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arkansas Power & Light Company, Petitioner,
596 vs.
West Memphis Power & Water Company, The Town of West Memphis, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Katie E. Thomas,
Petitioner,
601 vs.
Archie C. McFall.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States Fidelity & Guaranty Company,
Petitioner,
606 vs.
Leong Dung Dye.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Des Moines Terminal Company,
Petitioner,
613 vs.
Des Moines Union Railway Company, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railway Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago Great Western Railway Company,
and Chicago, Burlington & Quincy
Railroad Company, Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari
614 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
Des Moines Union Railway Company, of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul
Railway Company, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edmund D. Adcock, On petition for writ of certiorari
Petitioner, to the United States Circuit Court
618 vs. of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thomas A. Grigg,
Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari
623 vs. to the United States Circuit Court
Tom Bolton, United States Marshal for of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.
the District of Montana, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

624 vs. to the Court of Claims.

Bonwit Teller & Co.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wisconsin Coca Cola Bottling Company and Milwaukee Coca Cola Bottling Company,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the

626 vs. State of Wisconsin.

E. L. Husting Company.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Bond and Mortgage Company and Trianon, Inc.,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court

628 vs. of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Lowenstein, as Trustee in
Bankruptcy of Meyer Reikes, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
629 vs.
Annie Reikes, Abe Wilk, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Lowenstein, as Trustee in
Bankruptcy of Meyer Reikes, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
630 vs.
I. N. Platt & Co., Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. Z. Wright, R. C. Wiggins, C. W. Jenkins, et al., Petitioners,
632 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James A. Tillman, Petitioner,
633 vs.
Russo-Asiatic Bank.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank L. Speakman, Ancillary Receiver and Trustee in Bankruptcy of the Lookout Mountain Hotel Company, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
635 vs.
Thomas W. Bryan, as State Receiver, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Petitioner,
637 vs.
C. M. Spencer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
638 vs.
Richard W. Didsbury.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

L. E. Dulion, Doing Business as Mason & Dulion,
Petitioner,
640 vs.
S. A. Lynch Enterprise Finance Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Inez B. Crandall,
Petitioner,
641 vs.
William Habbe, Sheriff of the County of Vanderburgh, Indiana.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Glenn E. Wolfe,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

648 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

The Prudential Insurance Company of of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

America.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

F. G. Corker,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

651 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

W. K. Howard, as Receiver of the of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

First National Bank of Dublin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bankers Utilities Company, Inc.,

and Butler F. Greer, On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioners, to the United States Circuit Court

653 vs. of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

National Bank Supply Company, Inc.,

David H. Zell, Inc., and David H. Zell.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Smith-Hamburg Scott Welding Co. of New York, Inc., and Scott Welded Products, Inc., Petitioners, vs. Charles Henry Bickell and Andrew A. Kramer. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

662

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert W. Hurt and Elmer R. Hurt, Petitioners, vs. New York Life Insurance Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

663

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following order:

O R D E R.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, February 29, to Monday, March 14, next.

W. Yale Smiley,
Petitioner,
617 vs.
Mike Holm, as Secretary of State, etc.

The joint motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank Clague in behalf of counsel.

General Motors Acceptance Corporation, et al.
574 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Joseph C. Myerson, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

The Atlantic Refining Company,
Petitioner,
619 vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams and Mr. John H. Stone for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. H. Brian Holland, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Broad River Power Company,
Appellant,
566 vs.
Walter C. Query, et al., etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. LePine and Mr. W. C. McLain for the appellant.

Lexington Water Power Company,
Appellant,
567 vs.
Walter C. Query, et al., etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. LePine and Mr. W. C. McLain for the appellant.

Charlie Reeves,
Appellant,
578 vs.
The Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. David F. Anderson for the appellant.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
621 vs.
William Randolph Scharton.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John Henry McEvers for the appellant.

The Atlantic Refining Company,
Petitioner,
619 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams, Mr. Ira Jewell Williams, Jr., Mr. Charles L. Guerin, and Mr. John H. Stone for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Frank Staley, Mr. H. Brian Holland, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
631 vs.
Bert Nellis.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rodger M. Trump, Mr. C. S. Jefferson, and Mr. Walter H. Bender for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph Very Quarles for the respondent.

Aetna Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
647 vs.
Mrs. Ethel V. Hagemyer, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry P. Lawther for the petitioner.

Vincent Kerens, Petitioner, 652 vs. Gladys Kerens Colket, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. Reed and Mr. Arnold Just for the petitioner, and by Mr. Luther Ely Smith, Mr. Elmer B. Pearcy, Mr. Fred L. Williams, and Mr. Earl F. Nelson for the respondents.
Florence M. Rodgers, et al., Petitioners, 655 vs. H. L. Bromberg, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen Wright for the petitioners.
James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner, 692 vs. Francis M. Reed, as Administrator, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis L. Waters for the petitioner, and by Mr. Paul Shipman Andrews for the respondent.
The United States of America, Petitioner, 466 vs. Daniel M. Lefkowitz and Pauline Paris.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. David P. Siegel for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner.
Robert M. Leach, Executor, etc., Petitioner, 468 vs. Malcolm E. Nichols, Formerly Collector of Internal Revenue.	This case was argued by Mr. O. Walker Taylor for the petitioner and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Hugg for the respondent.

George L. Shearer,

Petitioner,

469 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue;

William A. W. Stewart,

Petitioner,

470 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. M'Cready Sykes for the petitioners.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Monte Appel, It is ordered that Norris E. Pierson, Esquire, of Stamford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Vernon E. Hodges, It is ordered that Henry Gilligan, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue,
514 vs.
John H. Donnan, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. B. G. Carson, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Wayne Johnson, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

George L. Shearer,
Petitioner,
469 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue;
William A. W. Stewart,
Petitioner,
470 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. M'Cready Sykes for the petitioners and Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. M'Cready Sykes for the petitioners.

Public Service Commission of Montana, et al., etc.,
Appellants,
471 vs.
Great Northern Utilities Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Francis A. Silver for the appellants, and by Mr. H. G. Toomey for the appellee.

New York Title and Mortgage Company,
Appellant,
475 vs.
W. A. Tarver, et al., etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Nathan L. Miller for the appellants, and by Mr. Ireland Graves and Mr. Albert DeLange for the appellees.

Boston and Maine Railroad,
Petitioner,
477 vs.
Fred Armburg.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Philip H. Jones for the petitioner.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy St. Lewis, It is ordered that Grady Lewis, Esquire, of Muskogee, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence W. Rowley, It is ordered that Henry Lawlor, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.
514 vs.
John H. Donnan, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. H. Stanley Hinrichs, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of James Marshal, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Boston and Maine Railroad, Petitioner,
477 vs.
Fred Armburg.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Henry Lawlor, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of John M. Gibbons, Eugene J. Phillips, and Henry Lawlor, as amici curiae, in this cause.

Boston and Maine Railroad,
Petitioner,
477 vs.
Fred Armburg.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Philip H. Jones for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Clarence W. Rowley for the respondent.

Canada Malting Company, Ltd., Petitioner,
487 vs.
Paterson Steamships, Ltd.;
British Empire Grain Company, Ltd., Petitioner,
488 vs.
Paterson Steamships, Ltd.;
Henry K. Starnes, Doing Business as H. K. Starnes & Company, Petitioner,
489 vs.
Paterson Steamships, Ltd.

These cases were argued by Mr. D. Roger Englar for the petitioners, and by Mr. Ray M. Stanley for the respondent.

Eastern Air Transport, Inc.,
Appellant,
504 vs.
South Carolina Tax Commission and
W. G. Query, et al., etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William Henry White, Jr., for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument. Leave was granted appellant to file reply brief within one week.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
513 vs.
O. B. Limehouse.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the appellant and continued by Mr. William C. Wolfe for the appellee.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ralph B. Stewart, It is ordered that Paul Kolisch, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy St. Lewis, It is ordered that Alton A. Vosburg, Esquire, of Scranton, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Roy St. Lewis, It is ordered that A. Floyd Vosburg, Esquire, of Scranton, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Thomas Taylor, It is ordered that Elmer G. Van Name, Esquire, of Camden, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Hamilton Lewis, It is ordered that John B. Borden, Sr., Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. L. Bulwinkle, It is ordered that Bennet Nove, Jr., Esquire, of Louisville, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that Paul L. Lindsay, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

W. Yale Smiley,
Petitioner,
617 vs.
Mike Holm, as Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota.

On consideration of the joint motion to advance this case,
It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is assigned for argument on Monday, March 14 next, as the seventh case for that day.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,
514 vs.
John H. Donnan, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Henry J. Richardson, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of St. Louis Union Trust Company and Andrew W. Johnson, as executors, as amici curiae, in this cause.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., 514 vs. John H. Donnan, et al.	On motion made to the Court by Mr. Milton Wallace, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Continental Illinois Bank & Trust Company, as executor, etc., et al., as amici curiae, in this cause.
The United States of America, Appellant, 513 vs. O. B. Limehouse.	The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. John P. Grace for the appellee.
American Trading Company, Petitioner, 506 vs. H. E. Heacock Co.; Wm. A. Rogers, Ltd., et al., Petitioners, 507 vs. H. E. Heacock Co.	These cases were argued by Mr. Harry D. Nims for the petitioners, and by Mr. Edward S. Rogers for the respondent.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., 514 vs. John H. Donnan, et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for Heiner, Collector, and by Mr. William G. Heiner for Donnan, et al.
Wallace S. Handy, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc., 546 vs. Delaware Trust Company, Executor, etc., et al.	This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for Handy, Collector, and by Mr. James H. Hughes, Jr., for Delaware Trust Company, Executor, et al.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
~~James C. McReynolds,~~
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Rigby, It is ordered that Kyle Rucker, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Willis Crane, It is ordered that Elwin B. Hadlick, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Hamel, It is ordered that Frank C. Olive, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ewin L. Davis, It is ordered that James G. Johnson, Esquire, of Knoxville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Hamel, It is ordered that Lee I. Park, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that M. Maurice Parshall, Esquire, of Savannah, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Western Distributing Company,

Appellant,

337 vs.

The Public Service Commission of the State of Kansas, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Public Service Commission of Montana, et al., etc., Appellants,
471 vs.
Great Northern Utilities Company.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court granting an interlocutory injunction in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, but without prejudice to the consideration and determination at final hearing of all questions of law and fact, including the question of the reasonableness, in the circumstances disclosed, of the order which is the subject of the suit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

New York Title and Mortgage Company, Appellant,
475 vs.
W. A. Tarver, W. S. Pope, and J. W. Deweese, Constituting the Board of Insurance Commissioners of the State of Texas.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court denying an interlocutory injunction in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, but without prejudice to the consideration and determination at final hearing of all questions of law and fact, including the question of the standing of the complainant to maintain this suit.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charlie Reeves,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

578 vs. State of Ohio.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad

Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice said:

In view of the large number of such orders, the other orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements, and upon applications for writs of certiorari, as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the Clerk of the Court.

—, Original.

Ex Parte: Gordon Dover, Petitioner,

On consideration of the motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Broad River Power Company, Appellant,

566 vs.

Walter G. Query, et al., etc.

Lexington Water Power Company, Appellant,

567 vs.

Walter G. Query, et al., etc.

In these cases probable jurisdiction is noted and the cases are assigned for argument immediately following No. 542.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,
Appellant,
621 vs.
William Randolph Scharton.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, March 21 next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mike Chetkovich,
Petitioner,
597 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Aetna Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
647 vs.
Mrs. Ethel V. Hagemyer (Nee Killingsworth) and Husband, George Hagemyer.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Florence N. Rodgers and A. N. Rodgers, Petitioners, vs. H. L. Bromberg, et al.

655 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James C. Davis, Director General of Railroads, etc., Petitioner, vs. Francis M. Reed, as Administrator of the Estate of David M. Reed, Deceased.

692 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Atlantic Refining Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States.

619 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Atlantic Refining Company,
Petitioner,
619 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this case to the Court of Claims for further findings of fact,
It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lincoln Bank & Trust Company, et al., etc.,
Petitioners,
668 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On consideration of the motion by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent to defer the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause until March 14 next,
It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—

Ex parte: Pocono Pines Assembly Hotels Company, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of prohibition or for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Hiram B. Calkins for the petitioner and memorandum thereon submitted by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in behalf of the United States.

Gene G. Oliver,
Petitioner,
658 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Frank K. Nebeker, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

— Original,

Ex parte: John W. Keogh, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Keogh in that behalf.

William P. Deppe and Deppe Motors Corporation,
Petitioners,
670 vs.
General Motors Corporation.

On consideration of the motion in behalf of counsel for the petitioner for leave to file a reply brief within one week,
It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
11, Original. vs.
State of Indiana.

Report No. 4, of the defendant, State of Indiana, was presented to the Court.

Ugo Ferroni,
Petitioner,
721 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leslie P. Whelan for the petitioner.

McCormick & Company, Inc., and Durham Bros., Inc.,
Appellants,
599 vs.
W. G. Brown, State Commissioner of Prohibition, etc.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. D. Rummel and Mr. Philip C. Friese for the appellants.

Alice Slattery, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
609 vs.
Roual L. Cochran, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen C. Fisher for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. C. A. Sorensen, Mr. E. D. Crites, and Mr. T. F. Neighbors for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Southern Cities Distributing Company,
Appellant,
620 vs.
B. E. Carter, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Arnold, Mr. W. H. Arnold, Jr., and Mr. David C. Arnold for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. Benjamin E. Carter for the appellees.

Edward A. Thompson, Inc.,
Appellant,
657 vs.
Lumber Mutual Casualty Insurance Company of New York.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leo C. Weiler for the appellant.

Utah Power and Light Company,
Appellant,
722 vs.
Emmitt Pfost, Commissioner, etc., et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John F. MaCLane for the appellant.

Southern Cities Distributing Company,
Petitioner,
620 vs.
B. E. Carter, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Arnold, Mr. W. H. Arnold, Jr., and Mr. David C. Arnold for the petitioner, and by Mr. Benjamin E. Carter for the respondents.

William King Richardson,
Petitioner,
622 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. V. Cushman, Mr. T. T. Ansberry, and Mr. George E. Tew for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Melville D. Church, and Mr. H. Brian Holland for the respondent.

Gene G. Oliver,
Petitioner,
658 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., Mr. George N. Murdock, Mr. William E. Leahy, and Mr. Edward J. Callahan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. John Henry McEvers and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman, for the respondent.

Northern Life Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
659 vs.
Emman C. King.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John L. McNab for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ray T. Coughlin for the respondent.

Pearl Bellman Klein,
Petitioner,
661 vs.
United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence Koenigsberger for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin C. Brandenburg and Mr. Louis M. Denit for the respondent.

Piedmont and Northern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
664 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. S. O'B. Robinson, Jr., and Mr. H. J. Haynsworth for the petitioner, and by Mr. Nelson Thomas and Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton for the respondents, Interstate Commerce Commission, and by Mr. F. B. Grier, Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. Carl H. Davis, and Mr. Sidney S. Alderman for the respondent carriers.

Leo Brennen,
Petitioner,
665 vs.
Court Smith, Warden, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Leo Brennen pro se.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
666 vs.
Delbert Russell.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Howard Cobb and Mr. Harold E. Simpson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ephraim J. Page for the respondent.

Frigidair Sales Corporation,
Petitioner,
669 vs.
R. M. Marks.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elwood H. Seal for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry Gilligan for the respondent.

William P. Deppe and Deppe Motors Corporation,
Petitioners,
670 vs.
General Motors Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Atlee Pomerene and Mr. Wm. J. Hughes for the petitioners, and by Mr. J. L. Stackpole and Mr. Melville Church for the respondent.

The Mantle Lamp Company of America,
Petitioner,
673 vs.
The Geo. H. Bowman Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George I. Haight and Mr. Thomas G. Steward for the petitioner.

St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company,
Petitioner,
674 vs.
Effie K. Simpson, as Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold R. Small and Mr. A. L. Adams for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank Pace for the respondent.

Morgan Lithograph Company,
Petitioner,
678 vs.
Wezel & Naumann Aktiengesellschaft.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Drury W. Cooper for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. Houston Kenyon for the respondent.

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company,
Petitioner,
679 vs.
Overman Cushion Tire Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. F. O. Richey, Mr. William B. Cockley, and Mr. Spencer Gordon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert W. Byerly and Mr. William L. Day for the respondents.

Jack Guzik,
Petitioner,
680 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William F. Waugh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Carlton Fox, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman, for the respondent.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,
682 vs.
Reginald Steele.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Welles V. Moot for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.

Wabash Railway Company, Petitioner,
683 vs.
Irene R. Whitcomb, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles W. Stuart for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry M. Dowling for the respondent.

Leonard Jabczynski and Max Gurovich, Petitioners,
684 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George K. Bowden for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

A. F. McFee, Indicted as A. F. McPhee, Petitioner,
685 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry H. Parsons for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. A. E. Gottshall, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The State Bank and Trust Company, Petitioner,
690 vs.
Robert C. Lee, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis S. Posner for the petitioner, and by Mr. David Haar for the respondent.

MONDAY, MARCH 14, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jackson Palmer, It is ordered that Sydney C. Perell, Esquire, of Stamford, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., It is ordered that Lucian H. Vandoren, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Evans, It is ordered that Elmer P. Bromley, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis Halle, It is ordered that Milton R. Kroopf, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard P. Whiteley, It is ordered that Robert H. Winn, Esquire, of Chevy Chase, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jacob L. Holtzmann, It is ordered that Max Turner, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick C. Fisher, It is ordered that Thos. D. Aitken, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry N. Benson, It is ordered that William H. Gurnee, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George T. Simpson, It is ordered that Alfred Wellford Bowen, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward M. Reidy, It is ordered that Chester E. Stiles, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Whitney H. Seymour, It is ordered that George A. Spiegelberg, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, It is ordered that Joseph M. Paley, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank S. Bright, It is ordered that William H. Preese, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles A. Christopherson, It is ordered that Roy E. Willy, Esquire, of Sioux Falls, State of South Dakota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Berry King, It is ordered that John H. Miley, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Aaron Youngquist, It is ordered that Daniel Anderson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. J. Dickinson, It is ordered that William E. Wallace, Esquire, of Williamsburg, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. J. Dickinson, It is ordered that Harold B. Claypool, Esquire, of Williamsburg, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. L. J. Dickinson, It is ordered that John A. Murray, Esquire, of Logan, State of Iowa, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice said:

"The Court is advised that Judge Benjamin N. Cardozo, for many years Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, has been appointed an Associate Justice of this Court to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Justice Holmes. Judge Cardozo is present. The Clerk will read his Commission. Judge Cardozo will then take the oath of office, and the Marshal will escort him to the Bench".

The Clerk then read the commission as follows:

"Herbert Hoover,

President of the United States of America,

To all who shall see these Presents, Greeting:

Know Ye; That reposing special trust and confidence in the Wisdom, Uprightness and Learning of Benjamin Nathan Cardozo, of New York, I have nominated, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, do appoint him an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and do authorize and impower him to execute and fulfill the duties of that Office according to the Constitution and Laws of the said United States, and to Have and to Hold the said Office, with all the powers, privileges and emoluments to the same of right appertaining, unto Him, the said Benjamin Nathan Cardozo, during his good behavior.

In testimony whereof, I have caused these Letters to be made patent and the seal of the Department of Justice to be hereunto affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this second day of March, in the year
(SEAL) of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirty-two and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and fifty-sixth.

Herbert Hoover

By the President:

William D. Mitchell

Attorney General. "

The oath of office was then administered by the Clerk, and Mr.

Southern Pacific Company,

Petitioner,

339 vs.

The United States.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, so far as it relates to the question raised with respect to Engineer Officers of the War Department in performing duties in time of peace in connection with rivers and harbors improvements and the meetings of the California Debris Commission.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The Aetna Casualty and Surety Company,

Petitioner,

413 vs.

Phoenix National Bank and Trust Company of Lexington.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

William E. Lamb, Petitioner, vs. Sterling B. Cramer, et al. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

432

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

William E. Lamb, Petitioner, vs. William A. Schmitt, Receiver, etc. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

433

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Mississippi.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

George L. Shearer,

Petitioner,

469 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

William A. W. Stewart,

Petitioner,

470 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Boston and Maine Railroad, Petitioner, vs. Fred Armburg. 477

On writ of certiorari to the Municipal Court of the City of Boston, County of Suffolk, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Municipal Court of the City of Boston, County of Suffolk, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Municipal Court entered on a rescript from the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs, and interest until paid at the same rate per annum that similar judgments bear in the courts of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Frank Collis Bowers, as Executor of the Estate of Frank K. Bowers, Formerly United States Collector, etc., Petitioner, vs. Lawyers Mortgage Company. 355

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Home Title Insurance Company. 356

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

William Stevens, Petitioner, vs. The Vessel "White City," Her Engines, Tackle, Apparel, etc. 217

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

And it is further ordered that the petitioner, William Stevens, recover of and from the respondent, The Vessel "White City," the sum of $232.65 for unnecessary parts of the record which respondent caused to be printed for use in this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

D. Ginsberg & Sons, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Joseph Popkin. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

429

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Herbert S. Daniel, Trustee of Peters Trust Company, Bankrupt, Petitioner, vs. Guaranty Trust Company of New York. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

179

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Nebraska.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Robert M. Leach, Executor, etc.,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the United

468 vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for

Malcolm E. Nichols, Formerly Collector the First Circuit.

of Internal Revenue.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

333 vs. State of Mississippi.

O. L. Bunn, Doing Business as Bunn

Electric Company, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi and on a motion to dismiss, which was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the motion to dismiss the appeal in this cause be, and the same is hereby, sustained; and that the appeal herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Galveston Wharf Company, et al.,

Petitioners, On writ of certiorari to the

411 vs. Supreme Court of the

Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio State of Texas.

Railway Company, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of

Internal Revenue, On writ of certiorari to the United

Petitioner, States Circuit Court of Appeals for

426 vs. the Sixth Circuit.

Charles P. Leininger.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and the order of the Board of Tax Appeals affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

453 vs. On writ of certiorari to the

Hannah R. Temple, Administratrix of the Estate of Joseph R. Temple, Deceased. Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Eastern Air Transport, Inc.,

Appellant,

504 vs. Appeal from the District Court of the

South Carolina Tax Commission and W. G. Query, J. P. Derham, and Frank C. Robinson, etc. United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alice Slattery, Patrick Slattery,
William Slattery, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
609 vs.
Roual L. Cochran, Robert H. Willis,
John J. Rasmussen, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alice Slattery, Patrick Slattery,
William Slattery, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
609 vs.
Roual L. Cochran, Robert H. Willis, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Cities Distributing Company,
Appellant,
620 vs.
B. E. Carter, A. B. Clark, Mayor of Texarkana, Arkansas, and Mrs. Myra B. Mancarrow, etc., et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Cities Distributing Company,

Petitioner,

620 vs.

B. E. Carter, A. B. Clark, Mayor of Texarkana, Arkansas, and Mrs. Myra B. Mancarrow, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice said:

In view of the large number of such orders, the other orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements, and upon applications for writs of certiorari, as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the Clerk of this Court.

—

In re George D. Collins, Senior.

O R D E R.

It having been shown to the Court that George D. Collins, Senior, a member of the bar of this Court, was disbarred from the practice of the law by the Supreme Court of the State of California upon July 19, 1909, upon receipt by that court of a certified copy of the record of the conviction of the said Collins of a felony involving moral turpitude; and it appearing that the Supreme Court of California on May 8, 1922, denied, after hearing, the application of the said Collins for revocation of the said order of disbarment of July 19, 1909; and this Court having received and considered the return and response of the said Collins to a rule issued to him January 26, 1932, by this Court to show cause why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court,

It is ordered that the said George D. Collins, Senior, be, and he is hereby, disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice in this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ugo Ferroni,
Petitioner,
721 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ugo Ferroni,
Petitioner,
721 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

— Original.

Ex Parte: Pocono Pines Assembly Hotels Company, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus and/or prohibition herein,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

— Original.

Ex Parte: John W. Keogh, Petitioner,

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Commonwealth of Kentucky,
Complainant,
11 Original. vs.
State of Indiana, et al.

O R D E R.

Report No. 4 of the defendant, The State of Indiana, is received and ordered to be filed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Surety Company of New York,
Petitioner,
401 vs.
The Greek Catholic Union.

O R D E R.

In this cause it is ordered that the word "then" be deleted from the first line of the third paragraph of the opinion announced on February 15, 1932; otherwise the opinion will stand as heretofore announced.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

McCormick & Company, Inc., and Durham Bros., Inc.,
Appellants,
599 vs.
W. G. Brown, State Commissioner of Prohibition, etc.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Utah Power and Light Company,
Appellant,
722 vs.
Emmitt Pfost, Commissioner of Law Enforcement of the State of Idaho, et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted, and the case is advanced and assigned to follow No. 567, Lexington Water Power Co. vs. Walter G. Query, et al., etc.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward A. Thompson, Inc.,
Appellant,
657 vs.
Lumber Mutual Casualty Insurance Company of New York.

Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case is postponed to the hearing of the case on the merits.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Piedmont and Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
664 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission, Southern Railway Company, Charleston & Western Carolina Railway Company, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this application.

St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company, Petitioner,
674 vs.
Effie K. Simpson, as Administratrix of the Estate of A. E. Simpson, Deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Company, Petitioner,
631 vs.
Bert Nellis.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Vincent Kerens,

Petitioner,

652 vs.

Gladys Kerens Colket, Madeline Kerens Colket, St. Louis Union Trust Company, Trustee, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William King Richardson,

Petitioner,

622 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gene G. Oliver,

Petitioner,

658 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Northern Life Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Emma C. King. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

659

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Pearl Bellman Klein, Petitioner, vs. United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

661

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Leo Brennen, Petitioner, vs. Court Smith, Warden of the California State Prison at Folsom, California, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

665

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lehight Valley Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Delbert Russell. 666

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frigidair Sales Corporation, Petitioner, vs. R. M. Marks. 669

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William P. Deppe and Deppe Motors Corporation, Petitioners, vs. General Motors Corporation. 670

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Mandle Lamp Company of America, Petitioner, vs. The Geo. H. Bowman Company. 673 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Morgan Lithograph Company, Petitioner, vs. Wezel - Naumann Aktiengesellschaft. 678 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, Petitioner, vs. Overman Cushion Tire Company, Inc. 679 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jack Guzik,
Petitioner,
680 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
682 vs.
Reginald Steele.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Wabash Railway Company,
Petitioner,
683 vs.
Irene R. Whitcomb, Administratrix of the Estate of Samuel A. Whitcomb, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Indiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Leonard Jabczynski and Max Gurovich, Petitioners,
684 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. F. McFee, Indicted as A. F. McPhee, Petitioner,
685 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State Bank and Trust Company, Petitioner,
690 vs.
Robert C. Lee, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Perfect Shoe Mfg. Co., Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thomas C. Edwards,
790 vs.
The United States.

The joint motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher in that behalf.

John Vance Taylor,
Petitioner,
693 vs.
The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher to defer the submission of the petition for writ of certiorari in this cause for one week, It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Samuel S. Koenig, et al.,
Petitioners,
731 vs.
Edward J. Flynn, Secretary, etc.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin L. Fairchild for the petitioners.

The United States of America, Appellant,
568 vs.
Swift & Company, et al.;
American Wholesale Grocers Association, Appellants,
569 vs.
Swift & Company, et al.;
National Wholesale Grocers Association, Appellant,
570 vs.
Swift & Company, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. R. C. Fulbright, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of The Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association and others as amici curiae, in this cause.

The United States of America, Appellant,

568 vs.

Swift & Company, et al.;

American Wholesale Grocers Association, Appellants,

569 vs.

Swift & Company, et al.;

National Wholesale Grocers Association, Appellant,

570 vs.

Swift & Company, et al.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. R. C. Fulbright, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of American National Live Stock Association and others as amici curiae, in this cause.

George J. Adams, et al., Petitioners,

581 vs.

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, etc.

The resignation of Andrew W. Mellon, as Director General of Railroads, and the appointment of Ogden L. Mills as said Director, having been suggested, It is, on motion by counsel for the respondents, ordered by this Court that Ogden L. Mills, present Director General of Railroads, be substituted as a party respondent in this cause.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Amox Shriver, Appellant,

158 vs.

Woodbine Savings Bank of Woodbine, Iowa.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Earl F. Wisdom for leave to file brief of L. A. Andrew, Superintendent of Banking of the State of Iowa, as amicus curiae, and to participate in the oral argument of this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George J. Adams, et al.,
Petitioners,
581 vs.
Ogden L. Mills, Director General of Railroads, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. J. Stanley Payne, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Inter-State Commerce Commission, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Woolford Realty Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
582 vs.
J. T. Rose, Collector, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Albert S. Lisenby, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Western Pacific Railroad Corporation and Utah Fuel Company, as amici curiae, in this cause.

Woolford Realty Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
582 vs.
J. T. Rose, Collector, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Albert S. Lisenby, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Albert S. Weill, Hugh Satterlee, and Albert S. Lisenby, as amici curiae, in this cause.

— Original.
Ex parte: Harry Joseph Ryan, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein and for leave to proceed in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry Joseph Ryan pro se.

— Original.
Ex parte: State of Colorado, Petitioner.

The response to the rule to show cause herein was presented to the Court.

Margaret M. McCarthy,
Petitioner,
738 vs.
The United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, Garnishee.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Margaret M. McCarthy, pro se.

Herman Taylor, et al., Petitioners, 782 vs. State of Louisiana.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Moses C. Scharff for the petitioners.
People of the State of Michigan ex rel. Fred Palm, by A. Stanley Copeland, as Friend, Petitioner, 783 vs. Harry H. Jackson, Warden, etc.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Stanley Copeland, pro se.
Gertrude C. Solez, Petitioner, 789 vs. Zurich General Accident and Liability Insurance Company, Ltd., etc.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert and Mr. Percy A. Shay for the petitioner.
George P. Porter, auditor and ex officio Investment Commissioner of the State of Montana, Appellant, 627 vs. Investors Syndicate.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. A. Foot for the appellant.
George W. Streit, Doing Business under the name of G. W. Streit & Co., Appellant, 646 vs. J. M. Lujan, State Comptroller of the State of New Mexico, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Fahy for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. E. K. Neumann and Mr. Sam G. Bratton for the appellees in opposition thereto.
DePauw University, Appellant, 650 vs. Larry Brunk, Treasurer of the State of Missouri, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Justin D. Bowersock for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. John T. Barker and Mr. George W. Meyer for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Atlantic Cleaners and Dyers, Inc., et al., Appellants,
667 vs.
The United States of America.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dale D. Drain and Mr. Alvin L. Newmyer for the appellant.

Mills Novelty Company, Petitioner,
642 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Weymouth Kirkland and Mr. Willis D. Nance for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. H. Brian Holland, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Martin M. Philipsborn, Petitioner,
643 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Clarence N. Goodwin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Bradley B. Gilman, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

F. Couthoui, Inc., Petitioner,
645 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. LeFevre and Mr. Howard S. LeRoy for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. H. Brain Holland, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Army and Navy Club of America, Petitioner,
656 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin B. Pettus, Mr. M. F. Colladay, and Mr. George W. Burleigh for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Fred M. Dyar, Mr. H. Brian Holland, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Lincoln Bank & Trust Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
668 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elwood Hamilton for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. A. H. Conner, Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., and Mr. C. M. Charest for the respondent.

Planters Cotton Oil Company, Inc., of Waxahachie, Texas, et al.,
Petitioners,
672 vs.
George C. Hopkins, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joe A. Worsham and Mr. J. L. Gammon for the petitioners, and Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. Norman D. Keller, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the respondent.

George M. Ford,
Petitioner,
675 vs.
The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas J. O'Neill and Mr. Charles D. Lewis for the petitioner, and by Mr. John M. Gibbons, and Mr. Edward R. Brumley for the respondent.

Ricy W. Jones, et al.,
Petitioners,
681 vs.
Box Elder County, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Dan B. Shields for the petitioners, and by Mr. Lewis Jones for the respondents.

The Clifton Highland Company, et al., Petitioners,
686 vs.
The City of Lakewood, Ohio, et al., etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Miles E. Evans for the petitioners.

Carl Czarlinsky, alias C. Czarlinsky, Petitioner,
687 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. T. Hannett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Societe Enfants Gombault, et Cie, Petitioner,
688 vs.
The Lawrence-Williams Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lanier McKee and Mr. James R. Garfield for the petitioner, and by Mr. John F. Oberlin for the respondent.

City of Buffalo, Petitioner,
691 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert A. Hickman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Richardson, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

John C. Fairoloth,
Petitioner,
695 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Morris Wampler for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

James Trombetta,
Petitioner,
696 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Benjamin L. Stein for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. F. Cadmus Damrell, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Tess Ard,
Petitioner,
697 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Philip D. Beall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. A. E. Gottschall, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Jules C. L'Hote, et al.,
Petitioners,
698 vs.
Letus N. Crowell, Deputy Commissioner, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur A. Moreno for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Clifton Stone for the respondent, Letus N. Crowell.

James Akeroyd & Son,
Petitioner,
699 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Stuart Tompkins for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lawrence, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

John H. Page, Trustee, etc.,
Petitioner,
700 vs.
Arkansas Natural Gas Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frank J. Looney, Mr. Judson M. Grimmet, and Mr. Yandell Boatner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert S. Sloan for the respondent.

Minneapolis, St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company,
Petitioner,
701 vs.
Joseph Galvin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry S. Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Werner W. Schroeder for the respondent.

Mrs. Alpha L. Tolbert,
Petitioner,
702 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Erskine R. Myer and Mr. Norton Montgomery for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis H. Cooke and Mr. Henry McAllister for the respondent.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
703 vs.
Ray Berry.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rudolph J. Kramer, Mr. Bruce A. Campbell, Mr. Morison R. Waite, and Mr. William A. Rogers for the petitioner, and by Mr. William H. Allen for the respondent.

The United States,
Petitioner,
704 vs.
Barnim Kombst, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Clarence W. DeKnight and Mr. Frederick Schwertner for the respondents.

Florida East Coast Railway Company,
Petitioner,
708 vs.
Alfred Acheson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert H. Anderson for the petitioner, and by Mr. H. H. Taylor for the respondent.

J. G. Tyson,
Petitioner,
709 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Forrest McCutcheon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The Chas. H. Phillips Chemical Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. McKesson & Robbins, Inc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward S. Rogers, Mr. William J. Hughes, and Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry D. Nims and Mr. Minturn DeS. Verdi for the respondent.
710	
Abraham Franco, et al., Petitioners, vs. New York Life Insurance Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard T. Rives for the petitioners, and by Mr. Ray Rushton for the respondent.
711	
Walter J. MacDonald, Trustee, etc., Petitioner, vs. Plymouth County Trust Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert A. B. Cook for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph B. Jacobs for the respondent.
714	
Frank Shore, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James F. Reilly, Mr. William E. Leahy, and Mr. Wm. J. Hughes, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the respondent.
715	

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
719 vs.
Arthur F. Hall;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
719 vs.
Arthur F. Hall.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. John A. Selby and Mr. Henry Ravenel for the respondent.

Frederick S. Lang, Petitioner,
730 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles Dickerman William for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the respondent.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
734 vs.
Commercial Credit Company, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Dunne R. Dills and Mr. Berthold Muecke, Jr., for the respondent.

Saul Steinman, Petitioner,
743 vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel B. Kaufman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert Carey and Mr. Harry Lane for the respondent.

The Alcograph Company,
Petitioner,
777 vs.
Electrical Research Products, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. B. Lewright for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. L. Matthews for the respondent.

John T. Callahan,
Petitioner,
576 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Louis Halle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.

Herman O. Hagner, et al.,
Petitioners,
590 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. William E. Leahy for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.

Amox Shriver,
Appellant,
158 vs.
Woodbine Savings Bank of Woodbine, Iowa.

The reargument of this case was commenced by Mr. H. B. Claypool for the appellant.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elwood H. Seal, It is ordered that Albert E. Maves, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. Alfred Wellford Bowen, It is ordered that Donald O. Wright, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. George W. Offutt, It is ordered that Frederic Ullmann, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court by Mr. Simon H. Rifkind, It is ordered that Henry Epstein, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon H. Rifkind, It is ordered that Karl A. Blaustein, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert Ewing Thomason, It is ordered that Ben R. Howell, Esquire, of El Paso, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert S. Regar, It is ordered that Harry L. Siegel, Esquire, of Lewistown, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Monte Appel, It is ordered that Leon F. de Fremery, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Samuel S. Koenig, et al.,
Petitioners,
731 vs.
Edward J. Flynn, Secretary of State of the State of New York, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Abraham S. Gilbert and Mr. Benjamin L. Fairchild for the petitioners, and by ~~Mr. John J. Bennett, Jr.,~~ Mr. John Godfrey Saxe, and Mr. Henry Epstein for the respondents.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

Samuel S. Koenig, John J. Knewitz and William L. Ward, Petitioners, 731 vs. Edward J. Flynn, Secretary of State of the State of New York, et al.	Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
Samuel S. Koenig, John J. Knewitz, and William L. Ward, Petitioners, 731 vs. Edward J. Flynn, Secretary of State ofthe State of New York, et al.	On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Thursday, March 24th next at the head of the call for that day. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
Amos Shriver, Appellant, 158 vs. Woodbine Savings Bank of Woodbine, Iowa.	The reargument of this case was continued by Mr. J. A. Murray for the appellee; by Mr. Earl F. Wisdom for L. A. Andrew, Superintendent of Banking of the State of Iowa as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court, and concluded by Mr. W. K. Wallace for the appellant.
L. A. Nixon, Petitioner, 265 vs. James Condon, et al.	The reargument of this case was made by Mr. James Marshall and Mr. Nathan R. Margold for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ben R. Howell for the respondents.
Fox Film Corporation, Appellant, 118 vs. Paul H. Doyal, et al., etc.	The reargument of this case was commenced by Mr. William A. Sutherland for the appellant, and continued by Mr. Orville A. Park for the appellees.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Warren McLaine, It is ordered that M. B. Byington, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Herman J. Galloway, It is ordered that F. Eberhart Haynes, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter H. Newton, It is ordered that John A. Weeks, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Warren McLaine, It is ordered that C. G. Gilliland, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

341 vs.

Coronado Oil and Gas Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. D. A. Richardson, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Attorney General of the State of Illinois and Counsel for the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, as amici curiae, in this cause.

Fox Film Corporation,

Appellant,

118 vs.

Paul H. Doyal, et al., etc.

The reargument of this case was continued by Mr. Orville A. Park for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. William A. Sutherland for the appellant.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Pptitioner,

341 vs.

Coronado Oil and Gas Company.

This case was reargued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. D. A. Richardson and Mr. Thomas P. Gore for the respondent.

W. Yale Smiley,

Petitioner,

617 vs.

Mike Holm, as Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. George T. Simpson for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Alfred W. Bowen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry N. Benson for the respondent.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

W. Yale Smiley,
Petitioner,
617 vs.
Mike Holm, as Secretary, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Henry N. Benson for the respondent and concluded by Mr. William H. Gurnee for the respondent.

The Pacific Company, Ltd.,
Appellant,
270 vs.
Charles G. Johnson, State Treasurer, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Stuart Chevalier for the appellant, and by Mr. H. H. Linney and Mr. U. S. Webb for the appellee.

The United States of America, Appellant,
568 vs.
Swift & Company, et al.;
American Wholesale Grocers Association, et al., Appellants,
569 vs.
Swift & Company, et al.;
National Wholesale Grocers Association, Appellant,
570 vs.
Swift & Company, et al.

Four hours were allowed for the argument of these cases.
The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Assistant to the

FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl Richard Chindblom, It is ordered that Charles M. Thomson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Armitage, It is ordered that Charles F. Ayer, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul Armitage It is ordered that Carroll Searls, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George W. Offutt, It is ordered that Wm. S. Allen, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Stanley Reed, It is ordered that Irving B. Goldsmith, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Luther H. Reichelderfer, et al., etc., Petitioners,
729 vs.
Henry I. Quinn, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file brief of respondent on or before March 28th next, It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Appellant,
568 vs.
Swift & Company, et al.;
American Wholesale Grocers Association, et al., Appellants,
569 vs.
Swift & Company, et al.;
National Wholesale Grocers Association, Appellant,
570 vs.
Swift & Company, et al.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Edgar Watkins for the appellants in No. 569; by Mr. William C. Breed for the appellant in No. 570; by Mr. Frank J. Hogan for the appellees; and concluded by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellant in No. 568.

Thomas K. Glenn, Appellant,
526 vs.
Paul H. Doyal, et al., etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John A. Sibley for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Kansas City Public Service Company, Appellant,
521 vs.
John R. Ranson, as Collector, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Powell C. Groner for the appellant.

MONDAY, MARCH 21, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,

Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo, Associate Justices.

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph R. Little, It is ordered that Wilbur C. Davidson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas W. O'Brien, It is ordered that George R. Hemenway, Esquire, of Elmira, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence B. Des Jardines, It is ordered that Henry T. Hornidge, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence B. Des Jardines, It is ordered that William J. Dowd, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. E. Mark Sullivan, It is ordered that Maurice Palais, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Craig Peacock, It is ordered that Reginald S. Hemingway, Esquire, of Bloomsburg, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. Brantley, Jr., It is ordered that Lansing B. Lee, Esquire, of Augusta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Eugene C. Brokmeyer, It is ordered that Agatha O. La Londe, Esquire, of Fredericksburg, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton E. Hartley, It is ordered that Byron K. Elliott, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, It is ordered that Samuel H. Kaufman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles P. Sisson, It is ordered that Simon E. Sobeloff, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Josephus C. Trimble, It is ordered that Joseph L. Lewinson, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred Sutro, It is ordered that Eugene M. Prince, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon H. Rifkind, It is ordered that Abraham Wilson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter C. English, It is ordered that Donald Meyer Newman, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

New State Ice Company, Appellant, vs. Ernest A. Liebmann. — Appeal from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

463

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Brandeis in which Mr. Justice Stone concurs.

Mr. Justice Cardozo took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Southwest Utility Ice Company,

Appellant, Appeal from the United States Circuit

616 vs. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

Ernest A. Liebmann.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the above entitled cause shall abide the decree of this Court in the case of New State Ice Company vs. Ernest A. Liebmann, No. 463, October Term, 1931; and this Court having affirmed the decree of the said Circuit Court ofAppeals in the case of New State Ice Co. vs. Liebmann on March 21, 1932;

It is, pursuant to said stipulation, now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby,affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal

Revenue, 23d District of Pennsylvania,

514 vs. On a certificate from the United States

John H. Donnan, Sidney B. Donnan, Alvan Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third

E. Donnan, et al., etc. Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the affirmative. The answer to the first question makes an answer to the second question certified unnecessary.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland,

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Stone in which Mr. Justice Brandeis concurs.

Mr. Justice Cardozo took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Wallace S. Handy, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Delaware,

546 vs. On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

Delaware Trust Company, Executor Under the Last Will and Testament of William Du Pont, Deceased, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting. Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Cardozo took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

American Trading Company, Petitioner,

506 - vs.

H. E. Heacock Co.;

Wm. A. Rogers, Ltd., and American Trading Company, Petitioners,

507 vs.

H. E. Heacock Co.

On writs of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands.

These causes came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, and were argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court as follows: The judgment of the Court of First Instance of Manila is modified, in the provision for injunction, by striking out the words "importing and selling in the Philippine Islands" and substituting therefor the words "selling in local trade in the Philippine Islands", and, in the provision for accounting, by striking out the words "importation and sale in the Philippines" and substituting therefor the words "sale in local trade in the Philippine Islands"; and, with this modification, the judgments of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands are affirmed without costs.

And it is further ordered that these causes be, and the same are hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice Cardozo took no part in the consideration or decision

Thomas K. Glenn,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

526 vs. State of Georgia.

Paul H. Doyal, State Tax Commissioner.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George W. Streit, Doing Business Under the Name of G. W. Streit & Co.,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

646 vs. State of New Mexico.

J. M. Lujan, State Comptroller of the State of New Mexico, et al., etc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

De Pauw University,

Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of the

650 vs. United States for the Western

Larry Brunk, Treasurer of the State of Missouri, et al. District of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court dismissing the bill of complaint in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice said:

"In view of the large number of such orders, the other orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements, and upon applications for writs of certiorari, as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the clerk of this Court."

— Original.

Ex parte: The State of Colorado, Petitioner.

Upon consideration of the motion of the petitioner for leave to file petition for a writ of mandamus directed to the Honorable J. Foster Symes, Judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Colorado and to the said District Court of the United States, and of the response to the rule heretofore issued to show cause why leave to file such petition should not be granted,

It is ordered that leave to file the said petition for writ of mandamus be, and it is hereby, granted;

And it is further ordered that a rule issue to the said respondents, returnable on Monday, April 11th next, to show cause, upon printed briefs, why the writ of mandamus should not issue as prayed. All questions presented are reserved until the return of such rule.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

— Original.

Ex Parte: Harry Joseph Ryan, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motions be, and the same are hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Margaret M. McCarthy,
Petitioner,
738 vs.
The United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, Garnishee.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Margaret M. McCarthy,
Petitioner,
738 vs.
The United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation, Garnishee.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Herman Taylor, et al.,
Petitioners,
782 vs.
State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Herman Taylor, et al.,
Petitioners,
782 vs.
State of Louisiana.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

People of the State of Michigan, ex rel. Fred Palm, by A. Stanley Copeland, as Friend, Petitioner,
783 vs.
Harry H. Jackson, Warden of Michigan State Prison, Jackson, Michigan.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

People of the State of Michigan, ex rel. Fred Palm, by A. Stanley Copeland, as Friend, Petitioner,
783 vs.
Harry H. Jackson, Warden of Michigan State Prison, Jackson, Michigan.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Circuit Court of Jackson County, State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Circuit Court of Jackson County, State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gertrude G. Solez, Petitioner,
789 vs.
Zurich General Accident and Liability Insurance Company, Ltd., etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further herein in forma pauperis,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. A copy of the petition, brief, and record shall be served upon the respondent or its counsel as soon as the same shall have been printed. Brief for the respondent may be filed within two weeks of the date of such service. On the first motion day following the filing of brief for the respondent or the expiration of the time herein allowed for such filing the petition shall be submitted to the Court for consideration.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thomas C. Edwards,
790 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the joint motion to advance this case, it is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, April 11 next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George P. Porter, Auditor, etc., Appellants,
627 vs.
Investors Syndicate.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Atlantic Cleaners and Dyers, Inc., et al., Appellants,
667 vs.
The United States of America.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John H. Page, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
700 vs.
Arkansas Natural Gas Corporation.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
703 vs.
Ray Berry.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States,
Petitioner,
704 vs.
Barnim Kombst, Gertrude Luckhardt, Ilka Wichmann, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Planters Cotton Oil Company, Inc., of Waxahachie, Texas, et al.,
Petitioners,
672 vs.
George C. Hopkins, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of Texas.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for argument immediately following case No. 582, Woolford Realty Company, Inc. vs. J. T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jules C. L'Hote, et al.,
Petitioners,
698 vs.
Lotus N. Crowell, Deputy Commissioner, United States Compensation Commission, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted, limited to the question raised by the review of the Deputy Commissioner's finding as to the dependency of Zeb Payne.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Walter J. MacDonald, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Craig, Reed & Emerson, Inc., Petitioner,

714 vs.

Plymouth County Trust Company.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for argument immediately following case No. 700, Page, Trustee vs. Arkansas Natural Gas Corporation.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frederick S. Lang, Petitioner,

730 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, April 11th next, after the case heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner,

734 vs.

Commercial Credit Company, Inc.

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for argument immediately following case No. 574, General Motors Acceptance Corporation, et al. vs. The United States of America.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mills Novelty Company,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

642 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Martin M. Philipsborn,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

643 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

F. Couthoui, Inc.,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

645 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Army and Navy Club of America,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

656 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lincoln Bank & Trust Company and Martha C. Gwin, Executors of the Estate of Earl S. Gwin, Deceased,

Petitioners,

668 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George M. Ford,

Petitioner,

675 vs.

The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Clifton Highland Company, George W. Ellsasser and Annie Ellsasser,

Petitioners,

686 vs.

The City of Lakewood, Ohio, et al., etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Carl Czarlinsky, alias C. Czarlinsky, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 687

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Societe Enfants Gombault Et Cie, Petitioner, vs. The Lawrence-Williams Company. 688

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

City of Buffalo, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 691

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John G. Faircloth, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 695

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James Trombetta, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 696

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Tess Ard, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 697

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James Akeroyd & Son, Petitioners, vs. The United States. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

699

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Minneapolis, St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Joseph Galvin. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

701

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Alpha L. Tolbert, Petitioner, vs. New York Life Insurance Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

702

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Florida East Coast Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Alfred Acheson. 708

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. C. Tyson, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 709

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chas. H. Phillips Chemical Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. McKesson & Robbins, Incorporated. 710

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Abraham Franco and Matilda Franco, as
Trustee for Ralph Franco, Petitioners,
711 vs.
New York Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank Shore, Petitioner,
715 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
718 vs.
Arthur F. Hall.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
719 vs.
Arthur F. Hall.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Saul Steinman,
Petitioner,
743 vs.
The Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Alcograph Company,
Petitioner,
777 vs.
Electrical Research Products, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order:

O R D E R.

The Court will take a recess from Monday, March 28th, to Monday, April 11th, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arthur L. Whitmer, Petitioner,
717 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, et al., etc.

The suggestion of abatement was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondents.

John J. Carroll, Petitioner,
805 vs.
Charles U. Becker, Secretary, etc.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. F. Colladay for the petitioner.

Woolford Realty Company, Inc., Petitioner,
582 vs.
J. T. Rose, Collector, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. F. O. Graves, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Robert N. Miller and John G. Buchanan, as amici curiae, in this cause.

National Surety Company, et al., Petitioners,
726 vs.
Valeria E. Coriell, et al.;
National Surety Company, et al., Petitioners,
727 vs.
Valeria E. Coriell, et al.

On consideration of the motion to defer the submission of the petitions for writs of certiorari in these causes for one week,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George H. Lamb, as Deputy Sheriff, etc., et al.,
Appellants,
644 vs.
People of the State of New Jersey, ex rel. Frank T. Tierney.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Max Rhoade for the appellants.

Continental Baking Company, et al.,
Appellants,
677 vs.
Harry H. Woodring, as Governor, etc., et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles R. Wilke and Mr. John C. Grover for the appellants.

John Vance Taylor,
Petitioner,
693 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. Palmer Ingram for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The P. McGraw Wool Company,
Petitioner,
712 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry S. Mesirov, Mr. John C. Frazer, Mr. Samuel M. Richardson, and Mr. Albert MacC. Barnes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lawrence, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., and Mr. Ralph Folks for the respondent.

James W. Sconyers, Petitioner,
713 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Forrest McCutcheon for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the respondent.

Arthur L. Whitmer, Petitioner,
717 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lee D. Mathias for the petitioner.

Ralph Scala, et al., Petitioners,
720 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Elwood C. Godman for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Raymond E. Gidley, Petitioner,
728 vs.
Chicago Short Line Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles C. Spencer for the petitioner, and by Mr. Kemper K. Knapp, William Beye and Paul R. Conaghan for the respondent.

M. Bernstein & Sons, Petitioners,
732 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert MacC. Barnes and Mr. Robert Szold for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Lawrence, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. Ralph Folks for the respondent.

Brandywine Hundred Realty Company, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit
735 vs.	Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit
Anthony Cotillo.	was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles F. Curley for the petitioner, and by Mr. Reuben Satterthwaite, Jr., for the respondent.
I. Rude, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit
736 vs.	Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit
Joseph Buchhalter.	was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ernest Morris for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry E. Lutz for the respondent.
The United States of America, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit
795 vs.	Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit
Two Masted Auxiliary Schooner "Ruth Mildred," etc.	was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Louis Halle for the respondent.
General Import and Export Co., Inc., Petitioners,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit
811 vs.	Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit
The United States of America.	was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis Halle for the petitioner,
John J. Carroll, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State
805 vs.	of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. F. Colladay and Mr. Hyman C. Stein for the petitioner.
Charles U. Becker, Secretary, etc.	

Kansas City Public Service Company,
Appellant,
521 vs.
John R. Ranson, as Collector, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Powell C. Groner for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Peirce Coombes,
Petitioner,
528 vs.
Milton E. Getz.

This case was argued by Mr. Joseph L. Lewinson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Alfred Sutro for the respondent.

The United States of America,
694 vs.
George Otis Smith.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the United States.

TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,

Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Geo. Francis Williams, It is ordered that Ernest F. Williams, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. Y. Masters, It is ordered that Chester E. McCarty, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. U. Bon Ceaslin, It is ordered that James R. Claiborne, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

John J. Carroll,

Petitioner,

805 vs.

Charles U. Becker, Secretary of State of the State of Missouri.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John J. Carroll,

Petitioner,

805 vs.

Charles U. Becker, Secretary of State of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Thursday, March 24th next, immediately following No. 731, Samuel S. Koenig, et al., vs. Edward J. Flynn, Secretary of State of the State of New York, et al.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Champlin Refining Company, Appellant,

485 vs.

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.;

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.,

486 vs.

Champlin Refining Company.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Philip Kates, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,

514 vs.

John H. Donnan, et al.;

Wallace S. Handy, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.,

546 vs.

Delaware Trust Company, Executor, etc.

On consideration of the motion to have the mandates in these cases issued forthwith,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that the mandates in these cases issue forthwith.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America,

694 vs.

George Otis Smith.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. John W. Davis for the United States; by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court; by Mr. George Wharton Pepper for George Otis Smith; and concluded by Mr. John W. Davis for the United States.

The United States of America,

Appellant,

621 vs.

William Randolph Scharton.

This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the appellant, and by Mr. E. Mark Sullivan for the appellee.

Dayton C. Thomson, et al.,

Appellants,

529 vs.

Marshall N. Dana, et al.

This case was argued by Mr. W. Y. Masters for the appellants, and by Mr. Chester E. McCarty for the appellees.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,

Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,

Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,

Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. W. P. Z. German, It is ordered that Robert E. Hardwicke, Esquire, of Ft. Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ira C. Hersey, It is ordered that Albert B. Donworth, Esquire, of Houlton, State of Maine, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Arthur Monroe Free, It is ordered that Forrest E. Single, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul M. Segal, It is ordered that Max P. Zall, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Champlin Refining Company, Appellant,

485 vs.

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.;

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.,

486 vs.

Champlin Refining Company.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Cicero I. Murray, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the Oil States Advisory Committee, as amicus curiae, in these causes.

Champlin Refining Company, Appellant,

485 vs.

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.;

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al.,

486 vs.

Champlin Refining Company.

Four hours allowed for the oral argument of these cases. The argument was commenced by Mr. Harry O. Glasser for the Champlin Refining Company, continued by Mr. W. P. Z. German and Mr. John H. Miley for the Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma, et al., and concluded by Mr. James M. Beck for the Champlin Refining Co.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon H. Rifkind, It is ordered that William J. O'Shea, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ray Weightman, It is ordered that Edward C. Robison, Esquire, of Maysville, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward F. Colladay, It is ordered that Hyman C. Stein, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Leonidas C. Dyer, It is ordered that Harry P. Rosecan, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jed Johnson, It is ordered that Joel S. Estes, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Aaron Youngquist, It is ordered that Harry S. Stearns, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. Regis Noel, It is ordered that Joseph G. Sibley, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William F. Stevenson, It is ordered that Wingate Waring, Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred H. Dominick, It is ordered that Butler B. Hare, Esquire, of Saluda, State of South Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Washington Fidelity National Insurance Company,

Petitioner,

817 vs.

Winnie Burton.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Benjamin S. Minor, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Metropolitan Life Insurance Company and others, as amici curiae, in this cause.

Southern Railway Company, Appellant,

300 vs.

Commonwealth of Kentucky;

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General, etc., Appellant,

301 vs.

Commonwealth of Kentucky.

On consideration of the motion by counsel for the appellants to stay the issuance of the mandates in these cases for 30 days from this date,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Samuel S. Koenig, et al., Petitioners,

731 vs.

Edward J. Flynn, Secretary, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Abraham S. Gilbert for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Benjamin L. Fairchild for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry Epstein for the respondent. The argument was suspended temporarily.

John J. Carroll, Petitioner,

8035 vs.

Charles U. Becker, Secretary, etc.

This case was argued by Mr. Hyman C. Stein and Mr. Edward F. Colladay for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ray Weightman for the respondent.

Samuel S. Koenig, et al., Petitioners,

731 vs.

Edward J. Flynn, Secretary, etc.

The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Henry Epstein for the respondents.

MONDAY, MARCH 28, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Richard S. Doyle, It is ordered that W. Arthur Roseborough, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alfred Goldstein, It is ordered that Joseph T. Lieblich, Esquire, of Paterson, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Abner J. Swanson, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Isidore Hershfield, It is ordered that Max Kabatznick, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank F. Nesbit, It is ordered that Edward A. Sargoy, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Eaton, It is ordered that Arthur Xavier Erickson, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Eaton, It is ordered that Albert E. Sherlock, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Eaton, It is ordered that Emory L. O'Connell, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. O. Stanley, It is ordered that Raymond E. Durham, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Kansas City Public Service Company,
Appellant,
521 vs.
John R. Ranson, as Collector of Internal Revenue of Jackson County, Missouri.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dayton C. Thomson, Milo Thomson, and Carey Thomson, Jr., etc.,
Appellants,
529 vs.
Marshall N. Dana, N. T. Corrigan, J. C. Van Devert, et al., etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Oregon, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arthur L. Whitmer, Petitioner,
717 vs.
Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and Myrtle Tanner Blacklidge, Collector of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arthur L. Whitmer,

Petitioner,

717 vs. On writ of certiorari to the

Robert H. Lucas, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and Myrtle Tanner Blacklidge, Collector of Internal Revenue. United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and on the suggestion of the United States that this cause has abated.

On consideration whereof, It is ordered by this Court that the decrees of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals and of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois in this cause, vacated; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, be, and the same are hereby, remanded to the said District Court with directions to dismiss the proceeding as abated.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George H. Lamb, as Deputy Sheriff of the County of Queens, State of New York, et al., etc., Appellants,

644 vs.

People of the State of New Jersey, ex rel. Frank T. Tierney. Appeal from the Hudson County Court of Common Pleas, State of New Jersey.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Hudson County Court of Common Pleas, State of New Jersey, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George H. Lamb, as Deputy Sheriff of the County of Queens, State of New York, et al., etc., Appellants,
644 vs.
People of the State of New Jersey, ex rel. Frank T. Tierney.

Appeal from the Hudson County Court of Common Pleas, State of New Jersey.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Hudson County Court of Common Pleas, State of New Jersey, as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice said:

"In view of the large number of such orders, the other orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements, and upon applications for writs of certiorari, as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the clerk of this Court."

Continental Baking Company, et al., Appellants,
677 vs.
Harry Woodring, as Governor, etc., et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John Vance Taylor, Petitioner,
693 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for argument on Monday, April 11th next, after the cases heretofore assigned for that day.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Two-Masted Auxiliary Schooner "Ruth Mildred," etc. 795

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for argument immediately following No. 734, United States of America vs. Commercial Credit Company, Inc.,

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

General Import & Export Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 811

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for argument immediately following No. 734, United States of America vs. Commercial Credit Company, Inc.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

I. Rude, Petitioner, vs. Joseph Buchhalter. 736

Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thomas W. White, Collector of
Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
636 vs.
John L. Hall, et al., Executors.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles W. Anderson, Collector of
Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
689 vs.
Harold K. Guinzburg, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The P. McGraw Wool Company,
Petitioner,
712 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James W. Seonyers,
Petitioner,
713 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ralph Scala, Fred Vannucci and Thomas Walsh,
Petitioners,
720 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Raymond E. Gidley,
Petitioner,
728 vs.
Chicago Short Line Railway Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

M. Bernstein & Sons, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 732

On petition for writ of certiorari to the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Brandywine Hundred Realty Company, Petitioner, vs. Anthony Cotillo. 735

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order:

ORDER OF ALLOTMENT OF JUSTICES.

It is ordered, That the following allotment be made of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of this Court among the circuits, agreeably to the acts of Congress in such case made and provided, and that such allotment be entered of record, viz:

For the First Circuit, Louis Dembitz Brandeis, Associate Justice.
For the Second Circuit, Harlan Fiske Stone, Associate Justice.
For the Third Circuit, Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justice.
For the Fourth Circuit, Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice.
For the Fifth Circuit, Benjamin N. Cardozo, Associate Justice.
For the Sixth Circuit, James C. McReynolds, Associate Justice.
For the Seventh Circuit, Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.
For the Eighth Circuit, Pierce Butler, Associate Justice.
For the Ninth Circuit, George Sutherland, Associate Justice.
For the Tenth Circuit, Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice.

Chief
Per Mr./Justice Hughes.

Hart Glass Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
676 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion by counsel for the respondent for leave to file briefs in opposition to the petition for writ of certiorari and motion to remand on or before April 8 next,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America ex rel. Leo Stapf, Petitioner,
739 vs.
Edward Corsi, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

The suggestion of abatement was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Claude R. Branch for the respondent.

National Surety Company, et al., Petitioners,
726 vs.
Valeria E. Coriell, et al.;
National Surety Company, et al., Petitioners,
727 vs.
Valeria E. Coriell, et al.

On consideration of the motion to defer the submission of the petitions for writs of certiorari in these causes until April 11 next,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Boston and Maine Railroad, Petitioner,
477 vs.
Fred Armburg.

On consideration of the motion to have the mandate in this cause issued immediately,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that the mandate in this cause issue forthwith.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Washington, Complainant,
17, Original. vs.
The State of Oregon.

The motion to strike affirmative defenses in answer was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Blaine Mallon in behalf of counsel for the complainant in support of the motion, and by Mr. I. H. VanWinkle, Mr. George T. Cochran, and Mr. James A. Fee for the defendant in opposition thereto.

Ed Sproles, Appellant,
826 vs.
T. Binford, Sheriff, et al.

On consideration of the joint motion to advance this case,
It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, April 25 next.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hart Glass Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
676 vs.
The United States.

The motion to remand to the Court of Claims for further findings was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alan E. Gray for the petitioner.

John Logan, Petitioner,
827 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James A. O'Shea for the petitioner.

Peter Farrington, Appellant,
660 vs.
The People of the State of California.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Roland Beesey for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. U. S. Webb for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Ed Sproles, Appellant,
826 vs.
T. Binford, Sheriff, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of Court by Mr. R. C. Fulbright for the

George Endicott, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
671 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Merrill S. June for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Joseph H. Sheppard, Mr. Bradley B. Gilman, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Hart Glass Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
676 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles D. Hamel, Mr. John Enrietto, Mr. Frank C. Olive, and Mr. Alan E. Gray for the petitioner.

H. L. Mosher, Petitioner,
723 vs.
City of Phoenix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Ray for the petitioner.

H. L. Mosher, Petitioner,
724 vs.
City of Phoenix.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Ray for the petitioner.

Luther H. Reichelderfer, et al., etc., Petitioners,
729 vs.
Henry I. Quinn, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Lynch, Mr. William W. Bride, and Mr. Vernon E. West for the petitioners, and by Mr. Joseph A. Burkart, Mr. Henry I. Quinn, and Mr. George E. Sullivan for the respondent.

Welch Insurance Agency, Petitioner,
733 vs.
Edwin A. Brast, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. G. Hammond for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, Mr. John Mac C. Hudson, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Richard Nash, et al., Petitioners,
737 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

United States of America, ex rel. Leo Stapf, Petitioner,
739 vs.
Edward Corsi, Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold Van Riper for the petitioner.

The New York Trust Company, Trustee, etc. Petitioner,
740 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Du Pratt White for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Francis H. Horan for the respondent.

Osaka Shosen Kaisha, Individually, etc., Petitioner,
741 vs.
Habicht Braun & Company, et al.;
Osaka Shosen Kaisha, Individually, etc., Petitioner,
742 vs.
Habicht Braun & Company, et al.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George C. Sprague for the petitioner, and by Mr. Horace T. Atkins for the respondent.

John Wanamaker New York, Inc., Petitioner,
744 vs.
Walter R. Comfort, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. K. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Boykin Wright, Mr. R. Pratt Adams, and Mr. Lansing B. Lee for the respondents.

W. J. Cutcliff, Petitioner,
745 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Paul L. Lindsay for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. A. E. Gottschall, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Rosa, Monserrate Rafaela, et al., Petitioners,
747 vs.
Manuel Diaz Mediavilla, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry G. Molina for the petitioners, and by Mr. Gabriel I. Lewis for the respondent.

Chester R. Bunker,
Petitioner,
750 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Will C. Austin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the respondent.

Charles T. Gibson,
Petitioner,
751 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles T. Gibson, pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Rafael Cortes, as Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner,
752 vs.
Baltimore Insular Line, Inc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Basil O'Connor for the petitioner, and by Mr. George Whitefield Betts, Jr., for the respondent.

The State of Florida on the relation of Woods-Young Company,
Petitioner,
755 vs.
Honorable George W. Tedder, Judge, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carl A. Haasen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Cary D. Landis for the respondents.

Martha Briggs, Phelps, Executrix, etc., Petitioner,

756 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue;

The Northern Trust Company, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,

757 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue;

Martha Briggs, Phelps, Petitioner,

758 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert Pope and Mr. Benjamin M. Price for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. A. H. Connor, and Mr. F. Edward Mitchell for the respondent.

Dominic DeBonis, Petitioner,

759 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Union C. DeFord for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the respondent.

People ex rel. Alfred J. Neve, Petitioner,

760 vs.

Raymond J. Mulligan, United States Marshal, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. H. Crichton-Clarke for the petitioner, and by Mr. Francis L. Kohlman, Mr. Carl J. Austrian, and Mr. Saul J. Lance in behalf of Irving Trust Company, Trustee.

Sol Kogen,
Petitioner,
761 vs.
People of the State of Illinois, ex rel. George F. Harding, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John J. Kelly for the petitioner, and by Mr. J. Kent Greene for the respondent.

State of Missouri, at the relation of Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
763 vs.
Erwin G. Ossing, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold R. Small and Mr. Ashby M. Warren for the petitioner, and by Mr. Chilton Atkinson for the respondents.

Joseph E. Illick, et al.,
Petitioners,
764 vs.
Trust Company of Florida, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry K. Gibson and Mr. Henry W. Anderson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Mitchell D. Price, Mr. Robert S. Florence, Mr. D. H. Redfearn, Mr. Cary D. Landis, and Mr. H. P. Adair for the respondents.

Morris Schoenthal and Fannie R. Schoenthal,
Petitioners,
767 vs.
Irving Trust Co., as Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Horace London for the petitioners, and by Mr. Saul J. Lange for the respondent.

The Mahoning Coal Railroad Company, et al., Petitioners,

768 vs.

The United States of America;

The Mahoning Coal Railroad Company, Petitioner,

769 vs.

The United States of America;

The Mahoning Coal Railroad Company, Petitioner,

770 vs.

G. F. Routzahn, as Collector, etc.;

The Mahoning Coal Railroad Company, Petitioner,

771 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles C. Paulding and Mr. William Mann for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe for the respondents.

George Colletti, Petitioner,

772 vs.

The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. O. Ricketts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

William F. Kingston, Petitioner,

793 vs.

American Car and Foundry Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob Chasnoff and Mr. George C. Willson for the petitioner, and by Mr. William R. Gentry and Mr. Noah A. Stancliffe for the respondents.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until Monday, April 11 next,

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Palmer Ingram, It is ordered that Helen Elizabeth Brown, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel W. McIntosh, It is ordered that Alexander Seelow, Esquire, of Bayonne, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William G. Feely, It is ordered that Manley P. Caldwell, Esquire, of West Palm Beach, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Dickerman Williams, It is ordered that Jerome A. Strauss, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins, It is ordered that Frank Peter Keenan, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. Palmer Ingram, It is ordered that Samuel S. Levin, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George A. Meyser, It is ordered that James Barclay Smith, Esquire, of Lawrence, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Dickerman Williams, It is ordered that William E. Stevenson, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Alvah M. Shumaker, Esquire, of New Castle, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton L. French, It is ordered that Fred J. Babcock, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ewin L. Davis, It is ordered that Jesse L. Rogers, Esquire, of LaFollette, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Burton L. French, It is ordered that Sidman I. Barber, Esquire, of Boise, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Aaron Youngquist, It is ordered that Frank Corrin Hodgson, Esquire, of St. Paul, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Edward C. Bothwell, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc., as Owner of the Motorboat "Linseed King," etc.,
Petitioner,

430 vs.

Hilda M. Hicks, as Administratrix, etc., et al.
Vera Alexander, Administratrix of the Estate of James Alexander, Deceased, et al.,
Petitioners,

444 vs.

Spencer Kellogg & Sons, Inc.

On writs of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed in part and reversed in part, with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Stone join in part and concur in part.
Mr. Justice Sutherland is of opinion that the petition in No. 444 is not well founded and that the decree should be affirmed.

John T. Callahan, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 576

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Delaware.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. William Randolph Scharton. 621

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Massachusetts, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Amos Shriver, Appellant, vs. Woodbine Savings Bank of Woodbine, Iowa. 158

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The Pacific Co., Ltd.,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

270 vs. State of California.

Charles C. Johnson, State Treasurer

of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Sutherland in which Mr. Justice Van Devanter and Mr. Justice Butler concur.

United States of America, On writ of certiorari to the United

Petitioner, States Circuit Court of Appeals for

466 vs. the Second Circuit.

Daniel M. Lefkowitz and Pauline Paris.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Cardozo took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Herman O. Hagner and Julia C. Hagner, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 590 — On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Peirce Coombes, Petitioner, vs. Milton E. Getz. 528 — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of California for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Cardozo in which Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Stone join.

Canada Malting Company, Ltd., Petitioner, vs. Paterson Steamships, Ltd. 487 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of

British Empire Grain Company, Ltd., Petitioner, vs. Paterson Steamships, Ltd. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

488

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Cardozo took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Henry K. Starnes, Doing Business as H. K. Starnes & Company, Petitioner, vs. Paterson Steamships, Ltd. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

489

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Justice Cardozo took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The United States of America, Appellant, vs. O. B. Limehouse. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

513

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the orders of the said District Court sustaining a demurrer to the indictment and granting a motion to quash the indictment in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Cardozo took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Claiborne-Annapolis Ferry Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America, Chesapeake Beach Railway Company, and Interstate Commerce Commission. — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

454

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Mr. Justice Cardozo took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
341 vs.
Coronado Oil and Gas Company.

On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Stone in which Mr. Justice Brandeis, Mr. Justice Roberts, and Mr. Justice Cardozo join.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Brandeis in which Mr. Justice Stone and Justice Roberts join.

W. Yale Smiley,
Petitioner,
617 vs.
Mike Holm, as Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice Cardozo took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.

Samuel S. Koenig, John J. Knewitz,
and William L. Ward,

Petitioners,

731 vs.

Edward J. Flynn, Secretary of State of the State of New York, et al.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Albany.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Albany, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice Cardozo took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.

John J. Carroll,

Petitioner,

805 vs.

Charles U. Becker, Secretary of State of the State of Missouri, Jefferson City, Missouri.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice Cardozo took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Peter Farrington,

Appellant,

660 vs.

The People of the State of California.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Peter Farrington,

Appellant,

660 vs.

The People of the State of California.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of California.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of California as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John Logan,

Petitioner,

827 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John Logan, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

827

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice said:

"In view of the large number of such orders, the other orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements, and upon applications for writs of certiorari, as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the clerk of this Court."

O R D E R.

State of Washington, Complainant, vs. State of Oregon. — On motion of the complainant to strike the affirmative defenses in the answer is denied, without prejudice to further consideration at the final hearing, on the merits, of the matters now sought to be presented. The complainant shall have twenty-five days from this date within which to file a reply to the answer. Upon the filing of the reply, and when the cause is at issue, the Court will entertain a motion for the appointment of a Special Master to take the evidence and to report his findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for a decree.

17, Original.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company, Appellant,
333 vs.
O. L. Bunn, doing business as Bunn Electric Company, et al.

On consideration of the motion to tax damages against the appellant in this case, It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

M. Sproles, et al., Appellants,
336 vs.
T. Binford, Sheriff, etc., et al.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

H. L. Mosher, Petitioner,
723 vs.
City of Phoenix.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted, limited to the question of the jurisdiction of the District Court as a Federal court.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

H. L. Mosher, Petitioner,
724 vs.
City of Phoenix.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted, limited to the question of the jurisdiction of the District Court as a Federal court.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Luther H. Reichelderfer, Herbert B. Crosby and John C. Gotwals, Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Petitioners,
729 vs.
Henry I. Quinn, George J. Mueller, Jr., Henry Orth, Jr., et al.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America, ex rel. Leo Stapf, Petitioner,
739 vs.
Edward Corsi, Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Rafael Cortes, as Administrator of the Goods, Chattels and Credits of Victor Manuel Santiago, Deceased, Petitioner,
752 vs.
Baltimore Insular Line, Inc.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Morris Schoenthal and Fannie R. Schoenthal,
Petitioners,
767 vs.
Irving Trust Co., as Trustee in Bankruptcy of Leonard H. Smith, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ricy W. Jones and Carl W. Jones, and E. H. Jones, et al.,
Petitioners,
681 vs.
Box Elder County, T. L. Davis, C. C. Sweetin, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George Endicott, Trustee in Bankruptcy of The Samuel Winslow Skate Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
671 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Welch Insurance Agency,

Petitioner,

733 vs.

Edwin A. Brast, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Richard Nash and Philip De Stefano,

Petitioners,

737 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The New York Trust Company, Trustee under Trust Indenture, etc.,

Petitioner,

740 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Osaka Shosen Kaisha, Individually and as Claimant of S. S. Africa Maru,

Petitioner,

741 vs.

Habicht Braun & Company and Hirsch Bros. & Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Osaka Shosen Kaisha, Individually and as Claimant of S. S. London Maru,

Petitioner,

742 vs.

Habicht Braun & Company, Wah Chang Trading Corporation, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. J. Cutcliff,

Petitioner,

745 vs.

The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Rosa, Monserrate Rafaela, Rafaela
Monserrate, et al.,
Petitioners,
747 vs.
Manuel Diaz Mediavilla and his wife
Acisola Vazquez, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chester R. Bunker,
Petitioner,
750 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charles T. Gibson,
Petitioner,
751 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of Florida on the relation
of Woods-Young Company,
Petitioner,
755 vs.
Honorable Geo. W. Tedder, Judge of
the Twenty-second Judicial Circuit,
in and for Broward County, Florida, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Martha Briggs Phelps, Executrix of the
Estate of W. L. Phelps,
Petitioner,
756 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Northern Trust Company, Trustee
under the Will of Clinton Briggs,
Petitioner,
757 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Martha Briggs Phelps,
Petitioner,
758 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dominic DeBonis,
Petitioner,
759 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

People ex rel. Alfred J. Neve,
Petitioner,
760 vs.
Raymond J. Mulligan, United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sol Kogen,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

761 vs. to the Supreme Court of the

People of the State of Illinois, State of Illinois.

ex rel. George F. Harding, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State of Missouri, at the relation of

Louisville and Nashville Railroad

Company, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

763 vs. to the Supreme Court of the

Erwin G. Ossing and Henry A. Hamilton, State of Missouri.

Judges of the Circuit Court of the

City of St. Louis, Missouri and Ian Jones.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Joseph E. Illick, et al., On petition for writ of certiorari

Petitioners, to the United States Circuit Court

764 vs. of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Trust Company of Florida, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Mahoning Coal Railroad Company and
the New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioners,
768 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Mahoning Coal Railroad Company, Petitioner,
769 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Mahoning Coal Railroad Company, Petitioner,
770 vs.
C. F. Routzahn, as Collector of Internal Revenue for the Eighteenth District of Ohio.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Mahoning Coal Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 771

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George Colletti, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 772

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William F. Kingston, Petitioner, vs. American Car and Foundry Company and Carter Carburetor Corporation. 793

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John Wanamaker New York, Inc., Petitioner,
744 vs.
Walter R. Comfort, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this application.

Thomas G. Edwards,
790 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion of Mr. Solicitor General Thacher that leave be granted Mr. Hatton W. Sumners to appear and present oral argument on behalf of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives as amicus curiae in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
824 vs.
Henry Harmel.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Walter E. Barton as amicus curiae, in this cause.

Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen, etc., et al., Appellants,
553 vs.
The State of Ohio ex rel. J. Charles Bowman.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of the State of Ohio as amicus curiae, in this cause.

National Surety Company, et al., Petitioners,
726 vs.
Valeria E. Coriell, et al.;
National Surety Company, et al., Petitioners,
727 vs.
Valeria E. Coriell, et al.

On consideration of the motion to defer the submission of the petitions for writs of certiorari in these causes for two weeks,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,
13, Original. vs.
The City of New York.

The report of the City of New York of April 1, 1932, was presented to the Court.

19, Original.
Ex Parte: State of Colorado, Petitioner.

The return to the rule to show cause herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Mahlon D. Kiefer, and Mr. John J. Byrne.

N. E. Joyner, as Temporary Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
856 vs.
Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Company.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carl H. Richmond and Mr. John W. Bennett for the petitioner.

United States of America ex rel. Frank Jackson, Petitioner,
863 vs.
William D. Meyering, Sheriff, etc.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard E. Westbrooks for the petitioner.

C. A. Lindgren, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
864 vs.
United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob L. Morewitz for the petitioner.

Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Appellant,
706 vs.
A. N. Watson.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. J. Oven for the appellant.

The New York Central Securities Corporation, Appellant,
707 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. J. Hughes, Jr., and Mr. Wm. E. Leahy for the appellant.

Atlanta Laundries, Inc., et al., Appellants,
716 vs.
City of Newman, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. B. J. Mayer for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. H. A. Hall for the appellees in opposition thereto.

John M. Enright, et al., Petitioners,
705 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James D. Carpenter, Jr., Mr. John M. Enright, Eldon Bisbee and Mr. George R. Shields for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. Bradley B. Gilman for the respondent.

Isojiro Kitagawa, Petitioner, 748 vs. Oliver T. Shipman, Treasurer, etc., et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carl S. Carlsmith for the petitioner.
Mana Transportation Company, Limited, a Hawaiian Corporation, Petitioner, 749 vs. Oliver T. Shipman, Treasurer, etc., et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carl S. Carlsmith for the petitioner.
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Petitioner, 753 vs. Roxie Parker, as Administratrix, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Steiner, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. A. Denson for the respondent.
Monte Rico Milling and Mining Company, et al., Petitioners, 754 vs. The United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. N. Marron and Mr. Francis E. Wood for the petitioners, and by Mr. E. R. Wright for the respondent.

Trust No. 5833, Security-First National Bank of Los Angeles, etc., Petitioner,
762 vs.
Galen H. Welch, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Stuart Chevalier and Mr. Melvin D. Wilson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Claude R. Branch, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Wm. Cutler Thompson for the respondent.

Interstate Commerce Commission, Petitioner,
773 vs.
The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas M. Ross, Mr. Charles W. Needham, Mr. Robert E. Freer, and Miss Mary B. Linkins for the petitioner, and by Mr. John L. Hall and Mr. Charles O. Pengra for the respondents.

The Industrial Commissioner of the State of New York, Petitioner,
774 vs.
Irving Trust Company, as Trustee etc.;
The Industrial Commissioner of the State of New York, Petitioner,
775 vs.
Samuel C. Duberstein, as Trustee, etc.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph A. McClaughlin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Godfrey Goldmark for the respondent in No. 774.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,

776 vs.

Jacob F. Brown;

Jacob F. Brown, Petitioner,

797 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, and Miss Helen Carloss for the petitioner in No. 776 and respondent in No. 797, and by Mr. James Craig Peacock for the respondent in No. 776 and petitioner in No. 797.

Robert Ladow, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,

778 vs.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the State of Ohio, First Appellate District, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles P. Taft 2d for the petitioner, and by Mr. Benton S. Oppenheimer for the respondent.

Independent Oil Well Cementing Company, Petitioner,

780 vs.

Erle P. Halliburton, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arthur C. Brown and Mr. C. E. Hall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Leonard S. Lyon and Mr. Henry S. Richmond for the respondents.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Petitioner,

781 vs.

Paulina Morkevich, Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, First District, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. E. McInnis and Mr. Homer W. Davis for the petitioner, and by Mr. John K. Murphy for the respondent.

Southern Railway Company and Southern Railway-Carolina Division, Petitioners,
787 vs.
Mary Elizabeth Dantzler, as Administratrix, etc.;
Southern Railway Company and Southern Railway-Carolina Division, Petitioners,
788 vs.
Mary O. Youngblood, as Administratrix, etc.

The petitions for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. Frank G. Thompkins, and Mr. Sidney S. Alderman for the petitioners, and by Mr. William C. Wolfe for the respondents.

John P. Owen, Petitioner,
791 vs.
Kingsport Press, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. O. Ellery Edwards for the petitioner, and by Mr. Samuel H. Kaufman for the respondents.

Uncasville Manufacturing Company, Petitioner,
792 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Hughes for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.

Ostrander-Seymour Company, Petitioner,
794 vs.
Powers-Tyson Corporation, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wm. J. Hughes, Jr., Mr. Wm. E. Leahy, ~~and Mr. Meyer Abrams~~ for the petitioner, and by Mr. Benn M. Corwin for the respondents.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
799 vs.
J. Rogers Flannery & Company;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
800 vs.
Flannery Bolt Company;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
801 vs.
Vanadium Metals Company.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Norman D. Keller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Kenneth N. Parkinson and Mr. David A. Pine for the respondents.

A. N. Gossett, Administrator, etc., et al., Petitioners,
803 vs.
Edward F. Swinney, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Alfred N. Gossett, Mr. Wm. S. Allen, Mr. John T. Harding, and Mr. Henry L. Jost for the petitioners, and by Mr. Arthur Mag, Mr. Roy B. Thomson, and Mr. Wm. S. Hogsett for the respondents.

John Bela Martin, Petitioner,
804 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Talma L. Smith for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General St. Louis, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. W. Clifton Stone, and Mr. Wm. H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Nat J. Muir, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
806 vs.
Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eugene Hubbard for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. Marshall Bullitt for the respondent.

Fire Companies Building Corporation, Petitioner,
808 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James L. Fort and Mr. O. H. B. Bloodworth, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John Henry McEvers, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the respondent.

Earle & Stoddart, Inc., et al., etc., Petitioners,
809 vs.
Ellerman's Wilson Line, Ltd., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. Catesby Jones and Mr. James W. Ryan for the petitioners, and by Mr. Cletus Keating for the respondent.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Petitioner,
810 vs.
Annie Long.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James G. Johnson, Mr. James B. Wright, and Mr. Williston M. Cox for the petitioner, and by Mr. James A. Fowler and Mr. Jesse L. Rogers for the respondent.

Washington Fidelity National Insurance Company,
Petitioner,
819 vs.
Winnie Burton.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Walter C. Clephane, Mr. J. Wilmer Latimer, and Mr. Gilbert L. Hall for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. Gwynn Gardiner and Mr. George A. Maddox for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
824 vs.
Henry Harmel.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Robert Ash for the respondent.

A. B. Leach & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
832 vs.
Hugh W. Grant, Receiver, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Conrad H. Poppenhusen, Mr. Edward R. Johnston, and Mr. Floyd E. Thompson for the petitioner, and by Mr. James P. Wilson and Mr. Andrew M. Henderson for the respondent.

Thomas C. Edwards,
790 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Attorney General Mitchell for the United States, continued by Mr. M. Walton Hendry for Edwards, and concluded by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners on behalf of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, as amicus curiae by special leave of Court.

John Vance Taylor, Petitioner,
693 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. R. Palmer Ingram for the petitioner.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Ernest W. Bradford, It is ordered that A. Yates Dowell, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence Koenigsberger, It is ordered that Morris Simon, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence Koenigsberger, It is ordered that Selig C. Brez, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry D. Williams, It is ordered that Chas. Lyon Russell, Esquire, of Rayway, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Freer, It is ordered that Arthur P. Curran, Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Emanuel Celler, It is ordered that Henry S. Miller, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Stafford, It is ordered that Giles F. Clark, Esquire, of Wauwatosa, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Hans C. Nelson, Esquire, of Eureka, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck; It is ordered that Lester C. Leonard, Esquire, of Red Bank, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that James Wilfred McKinney, Jr., Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Harry Fisher Sewell, Esquire, of Whittier, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Darold D. DeCoe, Esquire, of Sacramento, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John Vance Taylor, Petitioner,
693 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. R. Palmer Ingram for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.

Frederick S. Lang, Petitioner,
730 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles Dickerman Williams for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Jerome A. Strauss for the petitioner. Leave was granted petitioner to file reply brief by Thursday next.

Jack Hardeman, Petitioner,
503 vs.
Albert T. Witbeck.

This case was argued by Mr. Patrick H. Loughran for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sidney L. Herold for the respondent.

Girard Trust Company, as Trustee, etc., Appellant,
530 vs.
Ocean & Lake Realty Company.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Frank J. Wideman for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
537 vs.
Peavy-Wilson Lumber Company;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
538 vs.
Peavy-Moore Lumber Company;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
539 vs.
Peavy-Byrnes Lumber Company.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Whitney North Seymour

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Kit F. Clardy, It is ordered that Hugh E. Lillie, Esquire, of Grand Haven, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hubert Victor Spike, It is ordered that Ernest W. Hotchkiss, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that Bartley C. Crum, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh H. Obear, It is ordered that Larry I. Moore, Esquire, of New Bern, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Dickstein, It is ordered that Benjamin Bernstein, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel Dickstein, It is ordered that Max Jacob Wolff, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Geo. W. Armstrong, Esquire, of Ft. Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. L. Bulwinkle, It is ordered that Arthur C. Jones, Esquire, of Gastonia, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. C. Dill, It is ordered that Frank Funkhouser, Esquire, of Spokane, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. L. Bulwinkle, It is ordered that Stephen B. Dolley, Esquire, of Gastonia, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Whitney North Seymour, It is ordered that Robert H. O'Brien, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Whitney North Seymour, It is ordered that John Jordan Wicker, Jr., Esquire, of Richmond, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
537 vs.
Peavy-Wilson Lumber Company;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
538 vs.
Peavy-Moore Lumber Company;
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
539 vs.
Peavy-Byrnes Lumber Company.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the petitioner, by Mr. Sidney L. Herold and John B. Files for the respondents, and concluded by Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the petitioner. Leave was granted respondents to file supplemental brief by Friday next.

South Carolina Power Company, Appellant,
542 vs.
South Carolina Tax Commission, et al.;
Broad River Power Company, Appellant,
566 vs.
Walter G. Query, et al.;
Lexington Water Power Company, Appellant,
567 vs.
Walter G. Query, et al.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Arthur R. Young for the appellant in No. 542; continued by Mr. George M. LePine for the appellants in Nos. 566 and 567. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Utah Power and Light Company,
Appellant,
722 vs.
Emmitt Pfost, Commissioner, etc., et al.

This case was argued by Mr. John F. MacLane for the appellant and by Mr. Sidman I. Barber for the appellees.

The Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania,
547 vs.
Joseph S. MacLaughlin, Collector, etc.;
Joseph S. MacLaughlin, Collector, etc.,
548 vs.
Alliance Insurance Company of Philadelphia.

The argument of these cases was commenced by Mr. Robert T. McCracken for the Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania, et al.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Josephus C. Trimble, It is ordered that William J. Byrne, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James T. Crouch, It is ordered that John M. Baber, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer R. Hendricks, It is ordered that Paul G. Redewald, Esquire, of Pittsburgh, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank H. Hitchcock, It is ordered that C. B. Wilson, Esquire, of Flagstaff, State of Arizona, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles Kerr, It is ordered that W. T. Kendrick, Jr., Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Small, It is ordered that Marion H. Eustace, Esquire, of Caldwell, State of Idaho, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney S. Alderman, It is ordered that Herman Woodward Winburn, Esquire, of Greensboro, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gilbert Bettman, It is ordered that Robert F. Denison, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney S. Alderman, It is ordered that Herbert F. Koch, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sidney S. Alderman, It is ordered that Rufus B. Hall, Jr., Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania,
547 vs.
Joseph S. MacLaughlin, Collector, etc.;
Joseph S. MacLaughlin, Collector, etc.,
548 vs.
Alliance Insurance Company of Philadelphia.

The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Robert T. McCracken for The Insurance Company of Pennsylvania, et al., and concluded by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for MacLaughlin, Collector.

Board of Commissioners of the County of Allen, etc., et al., Appellants,
553 vs.
The State of Ohio ex rel. J. Charles Bowman.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. H. E. Carling for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

Ogden & Moffett Company, et al., Appellants,
557 vs.
Michigan Public Utilities Commission, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Percy J. Donovan for the appellants. The Court declined to hear further argument.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner,
634 vs.
The United States.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. John W. Davis for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Newton K. Fox for the petitioner.

Continental Tie and Liber Company, Petitioner,
560 vs.
The United States.

This case was argued by Mr. George E. H. Goodner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the respondent.

General Motors Acceptance Corporation, et al.,
574 vs.
The United States of America.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the United States.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clair R. Hillyer, It is ordered that Franklin J. Stransky, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick Thatcher Marward, It is ordered that William G. Fitzpatrick, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Alvin L. Newmyer, It is ordered that George C. Gertman, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Olger B. Burtness, It is ordered that Sveinbjorn Johnson, Esquire, of Champaign, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Felix Hebert, It is ordered that Angelo Cianciarulo, Esquire, of Providence, State of Rhode Island, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis V. S. Oliver, It is ordered that Morton C. Steinberg, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Cordell Hull, It is ordered that Thomas G. McConnell, Esquire, of Knoxville, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that James V. Allred, Esquire, of Austin, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

574 General Motors Acceptance Corporation, vs. et al., The United States of America.

On consideration of the motion of Joseph G. Myerson for leave to appear and present oral argument as amicus curiae in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

General Motors Acceptance Corporation, 574 vs. et al. The United States of America;	The argument of these cases was continued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the United States in No. 574 and petitioner in No. 734, by Duane R. Dills for the respondent in No. 734, and submitted by Mr. John Thomas Smith for the General Motors Acceptance Corporation in No. 574.
The United States of America, Petitioner, 734 vs. Commercial Credit Company, Inc.	
The United States of America, Petitioner, 795 vs. Two-masted Auxiliary Schooner "Hugh Mildred," etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the petitioner, and by Mr. Milton R. Kroopf for the respondent.
General Import & Export Company, Inc., Petitioner, 811 vs. The United States of America.	This case was argued by Mr. Milton R. Kroopf for the petitioner, and by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist for the respondent.
George J. Adams, et al., etc., Petitioners, 581 vs. Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Franklin J. Stransky for the petitioners, and continued by Mr. Frank H. Towner for the respondent, Union Stock Yard & Transit Company.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo.
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. H. Kennedy McCook, It is ordered that Paul H. Mitchell, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wallace Streater, It is ordered that Frank D. Strader, Esquire, of Clarendon, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Darrouzet, It is ordered that Lee M. Kenyon, Esquire, of Galveston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tazewell Taylor, Sr., It is ordered that W. R. Ashburn, Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Russell M. Robinson, It is ordered that Richard Cecil Kelly, Esquire, of Greensboro, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter C. Clephane, It is ordered that Beatrice A. Clephane, of Chevy Chase, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tazewell Taylor, Sr., It is ordered that Tazewell Taylor, Jr., Esquire, of Norfolk, State of Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Louis B. Montfort, It is ordered that Fred A. Smith, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tilman B. Parks, It is ordered that Kenneth W. Coulter, Esquire, of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter C. Clephane, It is ordered that Edwin A. Riley, Esquire, of Macon, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon H. Rifkind, It is ordered that Gustave Schwartz, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles D. Hamel, It is ordered that H. E. Lindersmith, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Erwin N. Griswold, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. J. Frank Staley, It is ordered that Jacob Weinstein, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that Harold P. Small, Esquire, of Springfield, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Robert W. Williams, Esquire, of Baltimore, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that John B. Hollister, Esquire, of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Achilles Catsonis, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. L. Bulwinkle, It is ordered that William S. Coulter, Esquire, of Burlington, State of North Carolina, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tilman B. Parks, It is ordered that Edward H. Coulter, Esquire, of El Dorado, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court.

Frederick S. Lang, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 730

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Girard Trust Company, as Trustee Under
the Last Will and Testament of
Charles I. Cragin, Deceased,
Appellant,
vs.
Ocean & Lake Realty Company.

530

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

H. Frances Cragin and Girard Trust
Company, as Co-Trustees Under the
Last Will and Testament of Charles
I. Cragin, Deceased,
Appellants,
vs.
Palm Beach Ocean Realty Company.

531

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the respective parties have filed a stipulation providing that the above entitled cause shall abide the judgment of this Court and be controlled by the result of the case of Girard Trust Company, as Trustee, etc., vs. Ocean & Lake Realty Company, No. 530, October Term, 1931; and this Court having dismissed the appeal in said Ocean & Lake Realty Company case for the want of jurisdiction on April 18, 1932;

It is, pursuant to said stipulation, ordered and adjudged by this Court that the appeal herein be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Peavy-Wilson Lumber Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

537

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with instructions to remand the case to the Board of Tax Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court in Handy & Harman v. Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 284 U. S. 136.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Peavy-Moore Lumber Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

538

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with instructions to remand the case to the Board of Tax Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court in Handy & Harman v. Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 284 U. S. 136.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Peavy-Byrnes Lumber Company. 539

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with instructions to remand the case to the Board of Tax Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court in Handy & Harman v. Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 284 U. S. 136.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. J. Rogers Flannery & Company. 799

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. J. Rogers Flannery & Company. 799

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with instructions to remand the case to the Board of Tax Appeals for further proceedings in conformity

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Flannery Bolt Company. 800

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Flannery Bolt Company. 800

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with instructions to remand the case to the Board of Tax Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court in Handy & Harman v. Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 284 U. S. 136.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Vandium Metals Company.	Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Vanadium Metals Company.	On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with instructions to remand the case to the Board of Tax Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court in Handy & Harman v. Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 284 U. S. 136.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

South Carolina Power Company,

Appellant,

542 vs. Appeal from the District Court of
South Carolina T x Commission, Walter the United States for the
C. Query, J. P. Derham, and Frank Eastern District of South Carolina.
C. Robinson, etc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court denying an interlocutory injunction in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Broad River Power Company,

Appellant,

566 vs. Appeal from the District Court of the
Walter C. Query, J. P. Derham, and United States for the Eastern
Frank C. Robinson, as Members of and District of South Carolina.
Constituting the South Carolina
Tax Commission.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court denying an interlocutory injunction in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lexington Water Power Company,

Appellant,

567 vs.

Walter G. Query, J. P. Derham, and Frank C. Robinson, as Members of and Constituting the South Carolina Tax Commission.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court denying an interlocutory injunction in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ogden & Moffett Company, Henry Vroom & Son, Michigan Motor Transport Association, et al.,

Appellants,

557 vs.

Michigan Public Utilities Commission, et al.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said District Court denying an interlocutory injunction in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Board of Commissioners of the County
of Allen, in the State of Ohio; Eliza O. Zurmehly,
John W. Dunlap, et al., Appeal from the Supreme Court of the
Appellants, State of Ohio.
553 vs.
The State of Ohio ex rel. J. Charles Bowman.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Atlanta Laundries, Inc., and B. E. Peck,
Appellants,
716 vs. Appeal from the Supreme Court of the
City of Newnan, Joseph E. Brown, State of Georgia.
Mayor, C. W. Farmer, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice said:

In view of the large number of such orders, the other orders of the Court made this day, upon motions submitted, upon examination of jurisdictional statements, and upon applications for writs of certiorari, as shown upon the list certified by the Chief Justice, will not be announced orally and are filed with the clerk of this Court.

N. E. Joyner, as Temporary Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
856 vs.
Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Company.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

N. E. Joyner, as Temporary Administrator of the Estate of Willie Lawton Walker, Deceased, Petitioner,
856 vs.
Jefferson Standard Life Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America ex rel. Frank Jackson, Petitioner,
863 vs.
William D. Meyering, Sheriff, etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America, ex rel.
Frank Jackson,
Petitioner,
863 vs.
William D. Meyering, Sheriff of Cook County, Illinois.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. A. Lindgren, Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner,
864 vs.
United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

C. A. Lindgren, Administrator of the Estate of C. E. Barford, Deceased,
Petitioner,
864 vs.
United States Shipping Board Merchant Fleet Corporation.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The State of New Jersey, Complainant,	ORDER.
13, Original. vs.	The report of the defendant, City of
The City of New York.	New York, is received and ordered to be filed.
	Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
Seaboard Air Line Railway Company, Appellant,	Further consideration of the question
706 vs.	of the jurisdiction of this Court in
A. W. Watson.	this case is postponed to the hearing
	of the case on the merits.
	Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
The New York Central Securities Corporation, Appellant,	In this case probable jurisdiction
707 vs.	is noted.
The United States of America.	Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
Interstate Commerce Commission, Petitioner,	Order allowing certiorari.
773 vs.	The petition herein for a writ of cer-
The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, Old Colony Railroad Company, Boston & Providence Railroad Corporation, et al.	tiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the patition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
	Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this application.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company, Petitioner,
753 vs.
Roxie Parker, as Administratrix of the Estate of Samuel D. Parker, Deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway Company, and Southern Railway-Carolina Division, Petitioners,
787 vs.
Mary Elizabeth Dantzler, as Administratrix of the Estate of Lawrence Keitt Dantzler, Deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway Company, and Southern Railway-Carolina Division, Petitioners,
788 vs.
Mary O. Youngblood, as Administratrix of the Estate of Cleveland J. Youngblood.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Earle & Stoddart, Inc., et al., Owners of Cargo on Steamship "Galileo," Petitioners, vs. Ellerman's Wilson Line, Ltd., Owner of Steamship "Galileo."	Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
809	
Washington Fidelity National Insurance Company, Petitioner, vs. Winnie Burton.	Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
819	
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Henry Harmel.	Order allowing certiorari. The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
824	

The Industrial Commission/or of the
State of New York,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

774 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Irving Trust Company, as Trustee in of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
Bankruptcy of Joseph Auerbach, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Industrial Commission/or of the
State of New York,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

775 vs. to the United States Circuit Court

Samuel C. Duberstein, as Trustee in of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
Bankruptcy of Benjamin Lane, etc.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John M. Enright and Andrew Fletcher,
Jr., as Receivers of W. & A. Fletcher
Company, Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

705 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Isojiro Kitagawa,

Petitioner,

748 vs. On petition for writ of certiorari

Oliver T. Shipman, Treasurer of the County of Hawaii, and County of Hawaii. to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mana Transportation Company, Limited, a Hawaiian Corporation,

Petitioner,

749 vs. On petition for writ of certiorari

Oliver T. Shipman, Treasurer of the County of Hawaii, and County of Hawaii. to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Monte Rico Milling and Mining Company, Lawrence R. Boyd, Daisy E. Boyd, et al.,

Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

754 vs. to the Supreme Court of the

The United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company. State of New Mexico.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Trust No. 5833, Security-First
National Bank of Los Angeles, etc.,
Petitioner,
762 vs.
Galen H. Welch, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Sixth Collection District of California.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Robert Ladow, Administrator of the Estate of Welcome Ladow,
Petitioner,
778 vs.
The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the State of Ohio, 1st Appellate District.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals, of the State of Ohio, 1st Appellate District, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Independent Oil Well Cementing Company,
Petitioner,
780 vs.
Erle P. Halliburton and Halliburton Oil Well Cementing Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company,

Petitioner,

781 vs.

Paulina Morkevich, Administratrix of the Estate of Mike Morkevich, Deceased.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, 1st District.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Appellate Court of the State of Illinois, 1st District, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John P. Owen,

Petitioner,

791 vs.

Kingsport Press, Inc. and Brief English Systems, Inc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Uncasville Manufacturing Company,

Petitioner,

792 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ostrander-Seymour Company, Petitioner,
794 vs.
Powers-Tyson Corporation, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. N. Gossett, Administrator of the Estate of Charles M. Irwin, Deceased, et al., Petitioners,
803 vs.
Edward F. Swinney, et al., etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John Bela Martin, Petitioner,
804 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Nat. J. Muir, Administrator of the Estate of Sam McClaskey,

Petitioner,

806 vs.

Fidelity & Deposit Company of Maryland.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Fire Companies Building Corporation,

Petitioner,

808 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Louisville & Nashville Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

810 vs.

Annie Long.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Tennessee, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

A. B. Leach & Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
832 vs.
Hugh W. Grant, Receiver of the Struthers Furnace Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

General Motors Acceptance Corporation, et al.,
574 vs.
The United States of America.

On motion made to the Court in that behalf, leave was granted to file supplemental brief of Joseph C. Myerson, as amicus curiae, in this cause.

J. C. Isenberg, et al.,
Petitioners.,
880 vs.
George Sherman, et al.

The motion to print abbreviated record and for an extension of time to make service herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Bartley C. Crum for the petitioners, in support of the motion and by Mr. Oscar Sutro, Mr. Alfred Sutro, Mr. W. H. Lawrence, and Mr. Eugene M. Price for the respondents in opposition thereto.

Woolford Realty Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
582 vs.
J. T. Rose, Collector, etc.

On motion made to the Court by Mr. J. S. Y. Ivins, in that behalf, leave was granted to file brief of Kingman Brewster, James S. Y. Ivins, and Percy W. Phillips, as amici curiae, in this cause.

Adams Crease Gun Corporation,
Petitioner,
649 vs.
The Bassick Manufacturing Company.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Henry T. Mcnidge, counsel for the petitioner, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the writ of certiorari in this cause, all costs herein to be taxed against the petitioner, and to have the mandate issue forthwith;

Therefore, pursuant to said motion, it is ordered and adjudged by this Court that the writ of certiorari, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs, and that the mandate herein issue forthwith.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

--- Original.
Ex Parte: John W. Keogh, Petitioner.

The motion that writ of mandamus issue herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Keogh pro se with leave to file supplemental brief within ten days.

Neil McConlogue,
Petitioner,
872 vs.
A. G. Aderhold, Warden, etc.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Neil McConlogue, pro se.

Asbury Truck Company,
Appellant,
779 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Warren E. Libby for the appellant.

Morris Lavine, et al.,
Appellants,
786 vs.
The People of the State of California.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Morris Lavine pro se and Mr. Francis Forrest Murray for appellant Leontine Johnson in support thereof, and by Mr. U. S. Webb for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Union Trust Company of Detroit, Michigan, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
765 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. John S. Flannery, Mr. G. Bowdoin Craighill, and Mr. Caesar L. Aiello for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. H. Brian Holland, and Mr. Erwin N. Griswold for the respondent.

First Union Trust and Savings Bank, Trustee, Petitioner,
812 vs.
Consumers Company, et al., etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Rush C. Butler and Mr. Frank E. Markness for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edwin W. Sims, Mr. Franklin J. Stransky, and Mr. Cassius Prout for the respondents.

Vivian F. Baldwin, et al., Petitioners,
814 vs.
American Surety Company of New York.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James F. Ailshie, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Oliver O. Haga and Mr. Frank Martin for the respondent.

The Aetna Casualty & Surety Company, Petitioner,
815 vs.
Independent Bridge Company, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin W. Smith and Mr. John C. Bane, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward G. Bothwell for the respondent.

Speers Sand and Clay Works, Inc., Petitioner,
816 vs.
American Trust Company of New York, Trustee.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mary W. F. Speers pro se, and by Mr. Edward P. Keech, Jr., for the respondent.

Kentucky and Indiana Terminal Railroad Company, Petitioner,
817 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward P. Humphrey and Mr. Robert N. Miller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Morton K. Rothschild, and Mr. Erwin N. Griswold for the respondent.

Gulf States Steel Company and National Surety Company, Petitioners,
821 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John M. Perry, Mr. Augustus Benners, and Mr. John W. Drye, Jr., for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. H. Conner, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

The New York Central Railroad Company, Petitioner,
822 vs.
Gladys Rose Farmer, as Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William Mann for the petitioner, and by Mr. Henry S. Miller for the respondent.

Hugh Wourdack,
Petitioner,
823 vs.
Louis J. Becker, Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lon O. Hooker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Wm. Cutler Thompson, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

The United States of America,
Petitioner,
825 vs.
Wilfred Corriveau.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner.

The Jackson Iron & Steel Company,
Petitioner,
833 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Richard S. Doyle and Mr. Charles D. Hamel for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Andrew D. Sharpe, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Hugh Wells, Trustee in Bankruptcy, etc.,
Petitioner,
834 vs.
Beckie Siegel.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert A. Jones for the petitioner, and by Mr. Milton Koblitz for the respondent.

The Sovereigh Camp of the Woodmen of the World, Petitioner, 840 vs. Willie Neff.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Kansas City Court of Appeals of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John T. Harding and Mr. David A. Murphy for the petitioner, and by Mr. John G. Parkinson for the respondent.
Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company, Petitioner, 873 vs. Thomas Tschreppel.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph M. Bryson, Mr. C. S. Burg, Mr. W. W. Brown, and Mr. Douglas Hudson for the petitioner, and by Mr. John A. Hall for the respondent.
George J. Adams, et al., Petitioners, 581 vs. Ogden L. Mills, Director General, etc., et al.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Frank H. Towner for the respondent Union Stock Yard and Transit Company, by Mr. Sidney F. Andrews and Mr. A. A. McLaughlin for the respondent Mills, Director General of Railroads, and concluded by Mr. Franklin J. Stransky for the petitioners.
Keziah Reed, et al., Petitioners, 600 vs. Lorenzo Allen.	This case was argued by Mr. George C. Certman for the respondent, and the case was submitted by Mr. J. Wilmer Latimer, Mr. Walter C. Clephane, and Mr. Gilbert L. Hall for the petitioners.
S. B. Lawrence, et al., Appellants, 580 vs. State Tax Commission of the State of Mississippi.	This case was argued by Mr. Wm. H. Watkins for the appellants, and by Mr. J. A. Lauderdale for the appellee.

Hartford Accident & Indemnity Company, Appellant,	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. R. M. Robinson for the appellant.
525 vs.	The Court declined to hear further argument.
F. E. McPherson, Administrator, etc.	
Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, Petitioner,	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Henry S. Mitchell for the petitioner.
585 vs.	
James M. Burum.	

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to theCourt in this behalf by Mr. Frederic B. Scott, It is ordered that Jack Rinzler, Esquire, of Passaic, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederic B. Scott, It is ordered that E. Burke Finnerty, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Fred S. Purnell, It is ordered that John Rabb Emison, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George S. Hobart Cooper, It is ordered that Ralph E. Cooper, Esquire, of Newark, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. F. B. Swank, It is ordered that William Robert Burns, Esquire, of Oklahoma City, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph L. Hooper, It is ordered that Edward A. Bilitzke, Esquire, of Lansing, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that Joseph M. Burford, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Planters Cotton Oil Company, Inc., etc., et al., Petitioners,	On motion made to the Court by Mr.
672 vs.	Richard H. Wilmer, in that behalf,
George C. Hopkins, Collector of	leave was granted to file brief of
Internal Revenue, etc.	Frederick H. Wood, Hoyt A. Moore, and
	A. James Slater as amici curiae, in
	this cause.
Woolford Realty Company, Inc., Petitioner,	On motion made to the Court by Mr.
582 vs.	Frederick L. Pearce, in that behalf,
J. T. Rose, Collector of Internal	leave was granted to file brief of
Revenue, etc.	Frederick L. Pearce and George M.
	Morris, as amici curiae, in this cause.
Woolford Realty Company, Inc., Petitioner,	On motion made to the Court by Mr.
582 vs.	Henry M. Ward, in that behalf, leave
J. T. Rose, Collector of Internal	was granted to file brief of Louis
Revenue, etc.	Titus and Henry M. Ward as amici curiae,
	in this cause.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company, Petitioner,	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Henry S. Mitchell for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Ernest A. Michel for the respondent.
585 vs.	
James M. Borum.	
People of the State of Michigan, by John S. Haggerty, Secretary of State, etc., Petitioners,	This case was argued by Mr. Edward A. Bilitzke for the petitioner, and by Mr. Benjamin P. Merrick for the respondent.
598 vs.	
Michigan Trust Company, Receiver, etc.	
Woolford Realty Company, Inc., Petitioner,	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. William A. Sutherland for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the respondent.
582 vs.	
J. T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.	

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. Thew Wright, It is ordered that Meredith M. Daubin, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. Thew Wright, It is ordered that Thomas Linwood Lawrence, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William H. Stafford, It is ordered that Roland K. Wilde, Esquire, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Frank H. Rawlings, Esquire, of Fort Worth, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Carter, It is ordered that James C. Walsh, Esquire, of Oakland, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John W. Fisher, It is ordered that Gerald Donovan, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Rabb Emison, It is ordered that Pierre F. Goodrich, Esquire, of Indianapolis, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Marval Mills Logan, It is ordered that Mae Helm, of Morgantown, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Pedro Guevara, It is ordered that Buenaventura C. Lopez, Esquire, of Manila, Philappine Islands, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Woolford Realty Company, Inc.,
Petitioner,
582 vs.
J. T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. William A. Sutherland for the petitioner.

Planters Cotton Oil Company, Inc., of Waxahachie, Texas, et al., Petitioners,
672 vs.
George C. Hopkins, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. J. M. Burford for the petitioners, continued by Mr. Whitney North Seymour for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. William A. Sutherland for the petitioners.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,
608 vs.
Michael Duplak, by his next friend, etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Ralph E. Cooper for the petitioner, continued by Mr. Jack Rinzler for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. George S. Hobart for the petitioner.

North American Oil Consolidated, Petitioner,
575 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Herbert W. Clark for the petitioner.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis Seiberling, It is ordered that Edw. N. Heiser, Esquire, of Akron, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton S. Gunn, It is ordered that T. H. MacDonald, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Gordon Browning, It is ordered that James W. VanDyke, Esquire, of Paris, State of Tennessee, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Earl N. Hatcher, It is ordered that Walter T. Griffin, Esquire, of Marysville, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl C. Bachmann, It is ordered that W. C. Brown, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Carl C. Bachmann, It is ordered that R. Dennis Steed, Esquire, of Charleston, State of West Virginia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Maurice Epstein, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Byron B. Harlan, It is ordered that Barry S. Murphy, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Byron B. Harlan, It is ordered that Harry N. Routzohn, Esquire, of Dayton, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

North American Oil Consolidated, Petitioner,	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Herbert W. Clark for the petitioner, and concluded by Mr. Assistant
575 vs.	Attorney General Youngquist for the
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	respondent.

L. J. Blakey (Successor to R. E. Schumacher), Receiver, etc., Petitioner,	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Henry Eastman Hackney for the petitioner, continued by Mr. L. I. Moore for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. George P. Barse for the petitioner.
639 vs.	
Charles J. Brinson.	
Edward A. Thompson, Inc., Appellant,	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Leo C. Weiler for the appellant.
657 vs.	
Lumber Mutual Casualty Insurance Company of New York.	

FRIDAY, APRIL 22, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that Alex J. Ashen, Esquire, of Sacramento, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. David J. Shorb, It is ordered that Edward J. Brunenkant, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton S. Gunn, It is ordered that Henry M. Isaacs, Esquire, of Portland, State of Oregon, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Hart Glass Manufacturing Company,
Petitioner,
676 vs.
The United States.

On consideration of the motion to extend the time for filing respondent's brief to May 20th next,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway Company, Appellant,
300 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky;
Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, Appellant,
301 vs.
Commonwealth of Kentucky.

On consideration of the motion to stay the issuance of the mandates in these causes until May 28th next,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jules C. L'Hote, et al.,
Petitioners,
698 vs.
Lotus M. Crowell, Deputy Commissioner, United States Compensation Commission, et al.

This case was submitted by Mr. Arthur A. Moreno for the petitioners; by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General St. Lewis, Mr. Claude R. Branch, and Mr. W. Clifton Stone for the respondent, Lotus M. Crowell, Deputy Commissioner, etc.; and by Mr. H. W. Robinson for the respondent, Zeb Payne.

Edward A. Thompson, Inc.,
Appellant,
657 vs.
Lumber Mutual Casualty Insurance Company of New York.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Leo C. Weiler for the appellant. The Court declined to hear further argument.

McCormick & Company, Inc., et al., Appellants,
599 vs.
W. G. Brown, State Commissioner of Prohibition of the State of West Virginia, et al., etc.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Philip G. Friese for the appellants, continued by Mr. W. G. Brown and Mr. R. Dennis Steed for the appellees, and concluded by Mr. H. D. Rummel for the appellants.

George P. Porter, Auditor and Ex-Officio Investment Commissioner of the State of Montana, Appellant,
627 vs.
Investors Syndicate.

This case was argued by Mr. T. H. MacDonald for the appellant, and by Mr. M. S. Gunn for the appellee.

Piedmont and Northern Railway Company, Petitioner,
664 vs.
Interstate Commerce Commission, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. W. S. O'B. Robinson, Jr., for the petitioner.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Nelson Thomas, It is ordered that William Dee Becker, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Raymond Jones, It is ordered that Victor S. Beam, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Rudolph J. Kramer, It is ordered that John S. Marsalek, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thos. H. Lodge, It is ordered that Beverly W. Howe, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas Boylan, It is ordered that Thomas D. McBride, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Hartford Accident and Indemnity Company, Appellant,
525 vs.
F. H. McPherson, Administrator of Willie Gant, Deceased.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of North Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edward A. Thompson, Inc., Appellant,
657 vs.
Lumber Mutual Casualty Insurance Company of New York.

Appeal from the City Court of the City of New York, County of New York, State of New York.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the City Court of theCity of New York, County of New York, State of New York, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jules C. L'Hote, et al.,

Petitioners,

698 vs. On writ of certiorari to the United

Letus N. Crowell, Deputy Commissioner, States Circuit Court of Appeals for

United States Compensation Commission, the Fifth Circuit.

et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana with directions to affirm the order of the Deputy Commissioner rejecting the claim of Zeb Payne.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Morris Lavine and Leontine Johnson, Appeal from the District Court of

Appellants, Appeal, 2nd Appellate District,

786 vs. State of California.

The People of the State of California.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District, State of California, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Morris Lavine and Leontine Johnson, Appellants,
786 vs.
The People of the State of California.

Appeal from the District Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District, State of California.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the District Court of Appeal, 2nd Appellate District, State of California, as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice said:

The other orders of the Court appear upon the list certified to by the Chief Justice and filed with the Clerk and will not be announced orally.

Asbury Truck Company, Appellant,
779 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California.

In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

--- Original.

Ex parte: John W. Keogh, Petitioner.

On consideration of the petition that a writ of mandamus issue herein,

It is ordered by the Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. C. Isenberg, Mrs. Paul Isenberg, et al.,
Petitioners,
880 vs.
George Sherman, Richard A. Cooke, et al.

On consideration of the motion of the petitioner for leave to print an abbreviated record in this cause,
It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.
Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. C. Isenberg, Mrs. Paul Isenberg, R. M. Isenberg, et al.,
Petitioners,
880 vs.
George Sherman, Richard A. Cooke, A. W. T. Bottomley, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration or decision of this application.

Neil McConlogue,
Petitioner,
872 vs.
A. C. Aderhold, Warden of the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,
It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Neil McConlogue,

Petitioner,

872 vs.

A. C. Aderhold, Warden of the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

American Security Company of New York,

Petitioner,

494 vs.

Vivian F. Baldwin and E. R. Baldwin.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Gulf States Steel Company and National Surety Company,

Petitioners,

821 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The New York Central Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
822 vs.
Gladys Rose Farmer, as Administratrix of the goods, chattels and credits of John Austin Farmer, deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Vivian F. Baldwin and E. R. Baldwin,
Petitioners,
814 vs.
American Surety Company of New York.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for argument immediately following the argument in case No. 494, American Surety Co. vs. Baldwin.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Union Trust Company of Detroit, Michigan, Trustee under the Will of Deming Jarves, Deceased,
Petitioner,
765 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

First Union Trust and Savings Bank, Trustee, Petitioner, vs. Consumers Company, Goodrich Transit Company, George F. Getz, et al., etc.

812 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Aetna Casualty & Surety Company, Petitioner, vs. Independent Bridge Company, Now for Use of Alpha Portland Cement Company.

815 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Speers Sand and Clay Works, Inc., Petitioner, vs. American Trust Company of New York, Trustee.

816 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hugh Wourdack,

Petitioner,

823 vs.

Louis J. Becker, Collector of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Jackson Iron & Steel Company,

Petitioner,

833 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hugh Wells, Trustee in Bankruptcy for Harris Siegel, d. b. a. the Siegel Department Store, Bankrupt,

Petitioner,

834 vs.

Beckie Siegel.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Sovereign Camp of the Woodmen of the World, Petitioner, vs. Willie Neff. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Kansas City Court of Appeals, State of Missouri.

840

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Kansas City Court of Appeals, State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Thomas Tschreppel. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas.

873

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice also announced the following order of the Court:

O R D E R.

It is ordered by the Court that the call of the docket be suspended for the term on Friday, April 29 next, and that the Court will take a recess from Monday, May 2, until Monday, May 16 next.

It is further ordered that no petitions for writs of certiorari or other motions, except motions for admission to practice, will be received after Monday, May 23, next.

The United States of America, Appellant, 892 vs. Thomas W. Sowell.	Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

This cause having been called to the attention of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, counsel for the appellant, and he having moved the Court to dismiss the appeal in this cause and have the mandate issued forthwith;

Therefore, in pursuance of said motion, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed, and that the mandate herein issue forthwith.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Philip Godfrey, Appellant, 837 vs. James J. Godfrey, Executor, etc., et al.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Robinson for the appellant.
United States of America ex rel. Joseph C. Moran, Petitioner, 883 vs. Major Henry Hill, Warden, etc.	The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Eugene McCaffrey for the petitioner.
R. S. Sterling, Governor of the State of Texas, et al., Appellants, 746 vs. E. Constantin, et al.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. F. Smith and Mr. Dan Moody for the appellants.
The United States of America, Appellant, 807 vs. Shreveport Grain & Elevator Company.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General St. Lewis, and Mr. W. Clifton Stone for the appellant.

Philip Godfrey,
Appellant,
837 vs.
James J. Godfrey, Executor, etc., et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph W. Robinson for the appellant.

National Surety Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
726 vs.
Valeria E. Coriell, Morris White, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle, Mr. Saul S. Myers, Mr. Selden Bacon, and Mr. Gregory Hankin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Charles B. McInnis for the respondents.

National Surety Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
727 vs.
Valeria E. Coriell, Morris White, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles H. Tuttle, Mr. Saul S. Myers, Mr. Selden Bacon, and Mr. Gregory Hankin for the petitioners, and by Mr. Charles B. McInnis for the respondents.

Nathan Burnstein and George McNeil,
Petitioners,
798 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto Christensen for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Martin A. Morrison, Mr. Paul D. Miller, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

J. Chr. C. Hupfel Company, Inc., Petitioner,
813 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, as United States Collector, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. L. L. Hamby for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John C. Remey for the respondent.

Capital National Bank, Petitioner,
835 vs.
Board of Supervisors of Hinds County;
Capital National Bank, Petitioner,
836 vs.
City of Jackson.

The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. R. H. Thompson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Wm. H. Watkins and Mr. P. H. Eager, Jr., for the respondents.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, Petitioner,
838 vs.
State Board of Equalization and Assessment of Nebraska.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Wymer Dressler and Mr. Samuel H. Cady for the petitioner, and by Mr. C. A. Sorensen and Mr. Hugh LaMaster for the respondent.

Tony Milyonico and Phillip Abbacco, Petitioners,
839 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harold J. Bandy for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Paul D. Miller, Mr. A. E. Gottshall, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Security National Bank, a Corporation of Watertown, South Dakota,
Petitioner,
842 vs.
Ralph Young, as County Treasurer, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Perry F. Loucks for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ray F. Drewry for the respondent.

J. H. Johnson, F. W. Weaver, et al.,
Petitioners,
846 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Harry C. Weeks for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Wm. Cutler Thompson, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

169 Bales Containing Wool marked CC 1-169, Robert W. A. Wood, Claimant,
Petitioner,
848 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Carl E. Whitney and Mr. Francis C. Lowthorp for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General St. Lewis, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the respondent.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company,
Petitioner,
850 vs.
B. H. Squire, Administrator, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John Barry, Mr. M. L. Bell, Mr. W. F. Dickinson, Mr. Thos. P. Littlepage, and Mr. W. R. Bleakmore for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. R. Bell, Mr. W. A. Ledbetter, and Mr. H. L. Stuart for the respondent.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
852 vs.
Lewis Pine.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward T. Miller, Mr. Harry P. Warner, and Mr. Cecil R. Warner for the petitioners, and by Mr. David S. Partain for the respondent.

Albert Pick-Barth Company, Inc., Petitioner,
868 vs.
Mitchell Woodbury Company, Inc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward F. McClennen and Mr. Jacob J. Kaplan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward O. Proctor for the respondents.

Alphonse Capone, Petitioner,
891 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Michael J. Ahern, Mr. Albert Fink, and Mr. Frank K. Nebeker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. John H. McEvers, Mr. Paul D. Miller, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Piedmont and Northern Railway Company, Petitioner, 664 vs. Interstate Commerce Commission, Southern Railway Company, et al.	The argument of this case was continued by Mr. W. S. O'B. Robinson, Jr., for the petitioner, by Mr. Nelson Thomas for the respondent Interstate Commerce Commission, and concluded by Mr. Sidney S. Alderman for the respondents Southern Railway Company, et al.
St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company, Petitioner, 674 vs. Effie K. Simpson, as Administratrix, etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Harold R. Small for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frank Pace for the respondent.
Continental Baking Company, et al., Appellants, 677 vs. Harry H. Woodring, as Governor of the State of Kansas, et al., etc.	This case was argued by Mr. Walter T. Griffin for the appellees, and the case was submitted by Mr. Charles R. Wilks and Mr. John C. Grover for the appellants.
John H. Page, Trustee, etc., Petitioner, 700 vs. Arkansas Natural Gas Corporation.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Frank J. Looney for the petitioner.

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace Tillard Jones, It is ordered that Edmond I. Foley, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert A. B. Cook, It is ordered that Walter J. MacDonald, Esquire, of Brockton, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Simon H. Rifkind, It is ordered that John D. Fearhake, Esquire, of New Canaan, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Jules Henri Tallichet, It is ordered that W. McIver Streetman, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles B. Rugg, It is ordered that Sidney E. Smith, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that James F. Kemp, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

John H. Page, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
700 vs.
Arkansas Natural Gas Corporation.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Frank J. Looney for the petitioner, by Mr. John W. Davis for the respondent, and concluded by Mr. Yandell Boatner for the petitioner.

Walter J. MacDonald, Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
714 vs.
Plymouth County Trust Company.

This case was argued by Mr. Robert A. B. Cook for the petitioner, and by Mr. Joseph B. Jacobs for the respondent.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner,
703 vs.
Ray Berry.

This case was argued by Mr. Rudolph J. Kramer for the petitioner, and by Mr. John S. Marsalek for the respondent.

The United States, Petitioner,
704 vs.
Barnim Kombst, et al.

The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg for the petitioner, and continued by Mr. Frederick Schwertner for the respondents.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lee I. Park, It is ordered that John M. Campbell, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Sam R. Morrill, Esquire, of Houston, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Benjamin D. Tarlton, Esquire, of Corpus Christi, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Charles F. Kelley, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that James W. Tracey, Jr., Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Vincent A. Carroll, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that John A. Boyle, Esquire, of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John L. Cable, It is ordered that Claude J. Bartlett, Esquire, of Columbus, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

National Surety Company, et al., Petitioners,

726 vs.

Valeria E. Coriell, et al.;

National Surety Company, et al., Petitioners,

727 vs.

Valeria E. Coriell, et al.

On consideration of the motion by counsel for the respondents for leave to file a supplemental brief within five days,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States, Petitioner, 704 vs. Barnim Kombst, et al.	The argument of this case was concluded by Mr. Frederick Schwertner for the respondent.
Frederick B. Wells, 725 vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	This case was argued by Mr. James S. Y. Ivins for Wells, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.
Ed Sproles, et al., Appellants, 826 vs. T. Binford, Sheriff, et al.	The argument of this case was commenced by Mr. Charles I. Francis for the appellants, continued by Mr. Frank H. Rawlings for the appellants, and by Mr. Elbert Hooper for the appellees.

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1932

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Oscar W. Underwood, It is ordered that Edward K. Campbell, Esquire, of Birmingham, State of Alabama, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William P. Smith, It is ordered that John C. Evans, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence J. McLeod, It is ordered that Samuel Brezner, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Seiforde M. Stellwagen, It is ordered that James A. Dixon, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert L. Lisenby, It is ordered that John Wheeler Cleaton, Esquire, of Atlanta, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Ed Sproles, et al., Appellants,
826 vs.
T. Binford, Sheriff, et al.

The argument of this case was continued by Mr. Elbert Hooper for the appellees and concluded by Mr. LaRue Brown for the appellants.

Atlantic Cleaners and Dyers, Inc., et al., Appellants,
667 vs.
The United States of America.

This case was argued by Mr. Dale D. Drain for the appellants, and by Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian for the appellee.

I. Rude, Petitioner,
736 vs.
Joseph Buchhalter.

This case was argued by Mr. Ernest Morris for the petitioner and by Mr. Henry E. Lutz for the respondent.

Southern Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
787 vs.
Mary Elizabeth Dantzler, as Administratrix, etc.;
Southern Railway Company, et al., Petitioners,
788 vs.
Mary O. Youngblood, as Administratrix, etc.

These cases were submitted by Mr. H. O'B. Cooper, Mr. S. R. Prince, Mr. Frank C. Tompkins, and Mr. Sidney S. Alderman for the petitioners and by Mr. William C. Wolfe for the respondents.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
James C. McReynolds,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland, Associate Justices.
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Albert E. Steinem, It is ordered that Robert J. Blum, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Warren E. Miller, It is ordered that William C. Brewer, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lawrence Graves, It is ordered that Addison L. Gardner, Jr., Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. G. Aaron Youngquist, It is ordered that Helmer M. Peroe, Esquire, of Minneapolis, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Dallinger, It is ordered that Mark N. Turner, Esquire, of Buffalo, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Loy J. Molumby, It is ordered that John W. Mahan, Esquire, of Helena, State of Montana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wm. J. Driver, It is ordered that Abe Collins, Esquire, of De Queen, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John McDuffie, It is ordered that Herbert U. Feibelman, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis F. Glenn, It is ordered that Ferdinand Tunnell, Esquire, of Edwardsville, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Crafton Rogers, It is ordered that Will Shafroth, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tasker L. Oddie, It is ordered that A. L. Scott, Esquire, of Pioche, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

General Motors Acceptance Corporation, et al., vs. The United States of America. 574

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the first question certified must be answered in the negative. The second, third and fourth questions are not answered.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Cardozo.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Commercial Credit Company, Inc. 734

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed, and that the decrees of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas be, and the same are hereby, affirmed.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Cardozo.

Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.

The United States of America,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the United

795 vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for

Two-masted Auxiliary Schooner the Second Circuit.

"Ruth Mildred," etc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Cardozo.

General Import and Export Company, Inc.

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the United

811 vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for

The United States of America. the Second Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

Per Mr. Justice Cardozo.

L. A. Nixon,

Petitioner,

265 vs.

James Condon and C. H. Kolle.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Cardozo.

Separate opinion by Mr. Justice McReynolds, in which Mr. Justice Van Devanter, Mr. Justice Sutherland, and Mr. Justice Butler concur.

The United States of America,

Appellant,

568 vs.

Swift & Company, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said Supreme Court modifying the consent decree of February 27, 1920, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court with direction to dismiss the petitions to modify the consent decree.

Per Mr. Justice Cardozo.

The Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Butler, in which Mr. Justice Van Devanter concurs.

American Wholesale Grocers Association,
et al., Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the
569 vs. District of Columbia.
Swift & Company, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said Supreme Court, modifying the consent decree of February 27, 1920, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court with direction to dismiss the petitions to modify the consent decree.

Per Mr. Justice Cardozo.

The Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Butler, in which Mr. Justice Van Devanter concurs.

National Wholesale Grocers
Association, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the
Appellant, District of Columbia.
570 vs.
Swift & Company, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the order of the said Supreme Court, modifying the consent decree of February 27, 1920, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Supreme Court with direction to dismiss the petitions to modify the consent decree.

Per Mr. Justice Cardozo.

The Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Sutherland and Mr. Justice Stone took no part in the consideration and decision of this case.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Butler, in which Mr. Justice Van Devanter concurs.

The United States of America, vs. George Otis Smith. No. 694. On a certificate from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate and the transcript of record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the order of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia denying a petition for a writ of quo warranto in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

John Vance Taylor, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. No. 693. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Maryland for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice McReynolds.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Frederick B. Wells,
725 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is ordered by this Court that the said certificate be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Philip Godfrey,
Appellant,
837 vs.
James J. Godfrey, Executor, etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Philip Godfrey,
Appellant,
837 vs.
James J. Godfrey, Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Mary Godfrey, Deceased, et al.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chief Justice said:

ther orders of the Court appear upon the list certified to by

Philip Godfrey,

Appellant,

837 vs.

James J. Godfrey, Executor, etc.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice said:

The other orders of the Court appear upon the list certified to by the Chief Justice and filed with the clerk and will not be announced orally.

United States of America ex rel. Joseph C. Moran,

Petitioner,

883 vs.

Major Henry Hill, Warden, etc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this cause,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

United States of America, ex rel. Joseph C. Moran,

Petitioner,

883 vs.

Major Henry Hill, Warden, Illinois State Penitentiary, Joliet, Illinois.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Capital National Bank,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

835 vs. to the Supreme Court of the

Board of Supervisors of Hinds County. State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Capital National Bank,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

836 vs. to the Supreme Court of the

City of Jackson. State of Mississippi.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

R. S. Sterling, Governor of the State of Texas, et al., In this case probable jurisdiction is noted.

Appellants, Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

746 vs.

E. Constantin, et al.

The United States of America, In this case probable jurisdiction

Appellant, is noted.

807 vs. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Shreveport Grain & Elevator Co.

Nathan Burnstein and George McNeil, Petitioners,
798 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. Chr. C. Huffel Company, Inc., Petitioner,
813 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, as United States Collector of Internal Revenue, for the Third District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chicago & Northwestern Railway Company, Petitioner,
838 vs.
State Board of Equalization and Assessment of Nebraska.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Nebraska, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Tony Milyonico and Phillip Abbacco, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America. 839 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Security National Bank, a Corporation of Watertown, South Dakota, Petitioner, vs. Ralph Young, as County Treasurer of Codington County, South Dakota, et al. 842 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. H. Johnson, F. W. Weaver, E. W. Barr, et al., Petitioners, vs. David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. 846 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

169 Bales Containing Wool market

CC 1-169, Robert W. A. Wood, Claimant, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

848

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. B. H. Squire, Administrator of the Estate of Oscar L. Brooks, Deceased. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma.

850

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oklahoma, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company and United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, Petitioners, vs. Lewis Fine. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

852

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Albert Pick-Barth Company, Inc., Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

868 vs.

Mitchell Woodbury Company, Inc., et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Alphonse Capone, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

891 vs.

The United States of America.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following order of the Court:

O R D E R.

The Court will take a recess from today until Monday, May 16; from that day until Monday, May 23; and from that day until Tuesday, May 31, upon which day it will adjourn for the term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Philip Elting, Collector of Customs, Port of New York, Petitioner,
885 vs.
North German Lloyd.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file supplemental brief of the petitioner on or before May 13 next, It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

— Original.

Ex parte: Winfield A. Green, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick W. Dallinger in behalf of counsel for the petitioner.

Norfolk & Western Railway Company, Appellant,
796 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore W. Reath, Mr. Harvey B. Apperson, and Mr. D. Lynch Younger for the appellant.

The Railroad Commission of Texas, et al., Appellants,
844 vs.
Alfred Macmillan, Individually, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert E. Hardwicke for the appellants.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner,
766 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. B. Pierce for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Joseph H. Sheppard, and Mr. Bradley B. Gilman for the respondent.

Chang Chow, alias Chang Sau Mung, Petitioner,
784 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey F. Eldridge for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the respondent.

Yim Kim Lau, alias Yim Lee Keaw, Petitioner,
785 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Chauncey F. Eldridge for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the respondent.

J. H. Gwinn, Beneficiary, etc., Petitioner,
841 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas A. Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Erwin N. Griswold for the respondent.

Consolidated Book Publishers, Inc., Petitioner,
843 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edw. W. Everett for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Charles H. Weston, Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., Mr. Robert E. Healy, and Mr. Martin A. Morrison for the respondent.

Roxana Petroleum Corporation, etc., Petitioner,
845 vs.
A. C. Bollinger, etc., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Truman P. Young, Mr. Guy A. Thompson, and Mr. S. A. Mitchell for the petitioner, and by Mr. Oscar E. Carlstrom and Mr. Montgomery Winning for the respondents.

Otis W. Rowe, et al., Petitioners,
847 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Joseph A. Cantrel for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Paul D. Miller, Mr. Harry S. Ridgely, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Frank E. Cooper, as Trustee, etc., Petitioner,
851 vs.
Joseph W. Taylor.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert S. Phillips for the petitioner, and by Mr. N. B. K. Pettingill for the respondent.

Walter Kolis, Petitioner,
853 vs.
Charles Mesden.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert F. Cogswell for the petitioner.

Edwards H. Childs, as Trustee, etc., Petitioner, vs. Empire Trust Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Moses Cohen for the petitioner, and by Mr. Stuart McNamara and Mr. Leonard B. Smith for the respondent.
854	
Dorothy Baker Stimpson, Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein tothe United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George H. Moore and Mr. William M. Fitch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Norman D. Keller, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.
855	
John C. Winston Company, Petitioner, vs. Warren Trimble, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Marcellus Green, Mr. William H. Watkins, and Mr. Garner W. Green for the petitioner, and by Mr. L. T. Kennedy for the respondents.
858	
Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. W. G. Shellenbarger.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Charles A. Hart, Mr. Charles H. Carey, and Mr. Charles E. McCulloch for the petitioner, and by Mr. Dan J. Malarkey for the respondent.
860	

Atascosa County State Bank of Jourdanton, Texas, Petitioner, 861 vs. M. Coppard, Trustee, etc., et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Victor Keller for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sylvan Lang for the respondents.
Cornell Steamboat Company, Petitioner, 878 vs. Shamrock Towing Company; Cornell Steamboat Company, Petitioner, 879 vs. James A. Meenan, Inc.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert S. Erskine for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward Ash for the respondent in No. 878 and Mr. John W. Griffin for the respondent in No. 879.
Bernard L. Shapiro, Petitioner, 881 vs. Horace B. Wilgus, et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob Weinstein and Mr. Francis Biddle for the petitioner, and by Mr. Sidney E. Smith for the respondents.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler, Associate Justices.
Harlan F. Stone,
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Aaron Youngquist, It is ordered that Joyce S. Lewis, Esquire, of Long Prairie, State of Minnesota, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Otis F. Glenn, It is ordered that William S. Kleinman, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Henry J. Balzer, It is ordered that Frederick W. Greene, Esquire, of Fort Wayne, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that Earle Farwell, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Chester I. Long, It is ordered that Warwick M. Downing, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Malcolm Baldrige, It is ordered that Geo. B. Boland, Esquire, of Omaha, State of Nebraska, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Elton L. Marshall, It is ordered that Miles Elliott, Esquire, of St. Joseph, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer R. Hendricks, It is ordered that Tom C. Clark, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hatton W. Sumners, It is ordered that Grover Adams, Esquire, of Dallas, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. D. D. Glover, It is ordered that Wm. H. Glover, Esquire, of Malvern, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert J. Bulkley, It is ordered that Joseph Saslaw, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley E. Disney, It is ordered that Gentry Lee, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Walter F. George, It is ordered that Hatton Lovejoy, Esquire, of LaGrange, State of Georgia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Robert E. Kline, Jr., It is ordered that Lawrence Lafayette Gourley, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Percy W. Phillips, It is ordered that William P. Chapman, Jr., Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Tom Connally, It is ordered that Spearman Webb, Esquire, of Sherman, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Luther A. Johnson, It is ordered that J. S. Callicutt, Esquire, of Corsicana, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, It is ordered that Edmund M. Toland, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joseph T. Robinson, It is ordered that Frank Bird, Esquire of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Blaine, It is ordered that S. B. Schein, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Whitney North Seymour, It is ordered that C. P. Seibert, Esquire, of Urbana, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

Woolford Realty Company, Inc.,

Petitioner,

582 vs.

J. T. Rose, Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Georgia.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Georgia.

Per Mr. Justice Cardozo.

Planters Cotton Oil Company, Inc.,
of Waxahachie, Texas, et al., Petitioners, vs. George C. Hopkins, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Second District of Texas. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

672

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Texas.

Per Mr. Justice Cardozo.

People of the State of Michigan, by John S. Haggerty, Secretary of State, Petitioners, vs. Michigan Trust Company, Receiver of Worden Grocer Company. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

598

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs, and that the decree of the District Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Cardozo.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice McReynolds.

St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company,

Petitioner,

674 vs. On writ of certiorari to the

Effie K. Simpson, as Administratrix Supreme Court of the

of the Estate of A. E. Simpson, State of Arkansas.

Deceased.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Cardozo.

The Texas & Pacific Railway Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

634 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Continental Tie and Lumber Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

560 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Piedmont and Northern Railway Company,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the United

664 vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for

Interstate Commerce Commission, the Fourth Circuit.

Southern Railway Company, Charleston & Western Carolina Railway Company, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of South Carolina, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court of the United States for the Western District of South Carolina.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

The Chief Justice took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Southern Railway Company and Southern Railway, Carolina Division,

Petitioners,

788 vs.

Mary O. Youngblood, as Administratrix of the Estate of Cleveland J. Youngblood, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Southern Railway Company and Southern Railway, Carolina Division,

Petitioners,

787 vs.

Mary Elizabeth Dantzler, as Administratrix of the Estate of Lawrence Keitt Dantzler, Deceased.

On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Joseph S. MacLaughlin, Collector of
Internal Revenue for the First
District of Pennsylvania,
548 vs.
Alliance Insurance Company of
Philadelphia.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

The Insurance Company of the State
of Pennsylvania,
547 vs.
Joseph S. MacLaughlin, Collector of
Internal Revenue for the First
District of Pennsylvania.

On a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the negative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Roberts took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

L. J. Blakey (Successor to R. E. Schumacher), Receiver of the First National Bank of New Bern, New Bern, North Carolina, Petitioner, vs. Charles J. Brinson.

639 On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Walter J. MacDonald, Trustee in Bankruptcy of Craig, Reed & Emerson, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Plymouth County Trust Company.

714 On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

John H. Page, Trustee, etc., Petitioner, vs. Arkansas Natural Gas Corporation. 700 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Ray Berry. 703 — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri for further proceedings not inconsistent with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

S. B. Lawrence, et al.,

Appellants, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

580 vs. State of Mississippi.

State Tax Commission of the State

of Mississippi.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Mississippi, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Van Devanter dissents from so much of the opinion as concerns the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Champlin Refining Company,

Appellant, Appeal from the District Court of the

122 vs. United States for the Western

Corporation Commission of the State District of Oklahoma.

of Oklahoma, et al., etc.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Champlin Refining Company,

Appellant,

485 vs. Appeal from the District Court of the

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma and Paul Walker, E. R. Hughes, and C. C. Childers, etc., et al. United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma and Paul Walker, E. R. Hughes, and C. C. Childers, etc., et al., Appellants,

486 vs. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Champlin Refining Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and as so modified, affirmed, without costs to either party in this Court; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Utah Power and Light Company,

Appellant,

722 vs. Appeal from the District Court

Emmitt Pfost, Commissioner of Law Enforcement of the State of Idaho, et al. of the United States for the District of Idaho.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Idaho, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Keziah Reed, Georgiana R. Simpson, Lillian M. H. Redding, etc., et al., Petitioners,

600 vs. On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Lorenzo Allen.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Appeals, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Cardozo in which Mr. Justice Brandeis and Mr. Justice Stone concur.

Bradford Electric Light Company, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Jennie M. Clapper, Administratrix. On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

423

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Hampshire for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Concurring: Mr. Justice Stone.

Mr. Justice Cardozo took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

Fox Film Corporation, Appellant, vs. Paul H. Doyal, et al., Members of the State Revenue Commission. Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.

118

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

McCormick & Company, Inc., and
Durham Bros., Inc.,

Appellants,

599 vs.

W. G. Brown, State Commissioner of Prohibition of the State of West Virginia, et al., etc.

Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of West Virginia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

825 vs.

Wilfred Corriveau.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner, vs. Wilfred Corriveau. 825

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of Rhode Island for further proceedings in conformity with the opinions of this Court in United States of America v. Two-Masted Auxiliary Schooner "Ruth Mildred," 286 U. S. —; General Import and Export Co. v. United States, 286 U. S. —; General Motors Acceptance Corporation v. United States, 286 U. S. —; and United States v. Commercial Credit Co., 286 U. S. —.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chang Chow, alias Chang Sau Mung, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 784

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Chang Chow, alias Chang Sau Mung, Petitioner,

784 vs.

The United States of America.

On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with directions to consider the sufficiency of the authentication of the record, and, if the record be found defective in this respect, to exercise its discretion, if proper application be made, to determine whether an opportunity should be afforded for authentication of the record so that the decision of the District Court may be reviewed by the Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Yim Kim Lau, alias Yim Lee Keau, Petitioner,

785 vs.

The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Yim Kim Lau, alias Yim Lee Keau, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

785

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals with directions to consider the sufficiency of the authentication of the record, and, if the record be found defective in this respect, to exercise its discretion, if proper application be made, to determine whether an opportunity should be afforded for authentication of the record so that the decision of the District Court may be reviewed by the Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice said:

The other orders of the Court appear upon the list certified by the Chief Justice and filed with the Clerk and will not be announced orally.

Norfolk & Western Railway Company, Appellant, vs. The United States of America and Interstate Commerce Commission. — In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

796

The Railroad Commission of Texas, et al. Appellants, vs. Alfred MacMillan, Individually, etc. — In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

844

National Surety Company, et al., Petitioners,
727 vs.
Valeria E. Coriell, Morris White, Inc., et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. H. Gwinn, Beneficiary of the Estate of M. A. Gwinn, Deceased, Petitioner,
841 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Bernard L. Shapiro, Petitioner,
881 vs.
Horace B. Wilgus and David Bachman, Receivers of Miller Robinson Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

National Surety Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
726 vs.
Valeria E. Coriell, Morris White, Inc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
766 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Consolidated Book Publishers, Inc.,
Petitioner,
843 vs.
Federal Trade Commission.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Roxana Petroleum Corporation, etc., Petitioner,
845 vs.
A. C. Bollinger, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Otis W. Rowe, Arthur L. Lyons and Michael A. Collins, Petitioners,
847 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank E. Cooper, as Trustee of the Estate of Joseph W. Taylor, Bankrupt, Petitioner,
851 vs.
Joseph W. Taylor.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Walter Kolis, Petitioner, vs. Charles Mosden. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

853

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Edwards H. Childs, as Trustee in Bankruptcy of the estate of Singer Furniture Corporation, Bankrupt, Petitioner, vs. Empire Trust Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

854

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dorothy Baker Stimpson, Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

855

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

John C. Winston Company, Petitioner, vs. Warren Trimble, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

858

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Great Northern Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. W. G. Shellenbarger. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

860

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Atascosa County State Bank of Jourdanton, Texas, Petitioner, vs. M. Coppard, Trustee of the Estates of Hurley Mercantile Company, et al., etc. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

861

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cornell Steamboat Company, Petitioner, vs. Shamrock Towing Company. 878

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cornell Steamboat Company, Petitioner, vs. James A. Meenan, Inc. 879

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—, Original.

Ex Parte: United States of America, Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner.

—, Original.

Ex Parte: Krentler-Arnold Hinge Last Co., Petitioner.

The motion for leave to file petition for writ of mandamus herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Otto F. Barthel for the petitioner.

—

In the Matter of the Disbarment of William E. Baff.

The report of the Committee of the Bar was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic D. McKenney, Mr. Reeve Lewis, and Mr. Joseph H. Milans.

— Original.

Ex Parte: John W. Keogh, Petitioner.

The motion that jurisdiction be assumed herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John W. Keogh, pro se.

Jacob Machman,
Petitioner,
952 vs.
The United States of America.

The motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Jacob Machman pro se.

Israel Lazar,
Appellant,
802 vs.
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Allen S. Olmsted, 2d, Mr. Walter Biddle Saul, Mr. Ira Jewell Williams, and Mr. Ira Jewell Williams, Jr., for the appellant in support thereof, and by Mr. James W. Tracey, Jr., and Mr. Charles F. Kelley for the appellee in opposition thereto.

Kerr Glass Manufacturing Corporation,
Appellant,
818 vs.
Superior Court of the State of Washington for Kings County, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. B. Tanner, Mr. John T. Garvin, and Mr. A. E. Clark for the appellant, in support thereof, and by Mr. Samuel B. Bassett for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Interstate Commerce Commission, et al., Appellants,
820 vs.
Oregon-Washington Railroad and Navigation Company, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Daniel W. Knowlton, Mr. J. Stanley Payne, Mr. I. H. Van Winkle, Mr. William G. McCulloch, Mr. William P. Ellis, and Mr. J. M. Thompson for the appellants in support thereof, and by Mr. Henry W. Clark, Mr. James M. Souby, and Mr. Arthur C. Spencer for the appellees in opposition thereto.

Stewart Drygoods Company, Appellant,
828 vs.
John B. Lewis, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert S. Marx, Mr. John C. Doolan, Mr. James Stites, and Mr. Frank E. Wood for the appellant.

Fred Levy, Appellant,
829 vs.
John B. Lewis, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert S. Marx, Mr. John C. Doolan, Mr. James Stites, and Mr. Frank E. Wood for the appellant.

J. C. Penny Company, Appellant,
830 vs.
John B. Lewis, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert S. Marx, Mr. John C. Doolan, Mr. James Stites, and Mr. Frank E. Wood for the appellant.

Kroger Grocery & Baking Company, Appellant,
831 vs.
John B. Lewis, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Robert S. Marx, Mr. John C. Doolan, Mr. James Stites, and Mr. Frank E. Wood for the appellant.

Advance-Rumley Thresher Company, Inc., Appellant, vs. A. M. Jackson.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. M. W. Murphy and Mr. Howard C. Fuller for the appellant.
849	
Girard Life Insurance Company, Appellant, vs. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.	The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Ira Jewell Williams for the appellant.
867	
Gertrude C. Solez, Petitioner, vs. Zurich General Accident & Liability Insurance Company, Ltd., of Zurich, Switzerland.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederic R. Coudert and Mr. Percy A. Shay for the petitioner, and by Mr. Russell T. Mount for the respondent.
789	
State of Florida ex rel. Fred H. Davis, etc., et al., Petitioners, vs. Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.	The petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Theodore T. Turnbull and Mr. Carry D. Landis for the petitioner and by Mr. F. B. Grier, Mr. William E. Kay, Mr. Thomas B. Adams, Mr. J. L. Doggett, and Mr. Carl H. Davis for the respondent.
[illegible]	

Mrs. Rose Cooke Morse, Petitioner, vs. Jennie G. Lewis, Administratrix, etc., et al.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Henry Simms for the petitioner, and by Mr. George E. Price and Mr. Robert S. Spillman for the respondents.
870	
Sun Oil Company, Petitioner, vs. Dalzell Towing Co., Inc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Russell T. Mount for the petitioner, and by Mr. Chauncey I. Clark for the respondent.
874	
Dry Ice Corporation of America, et al., Petitioners, vs. Louisiana Dry Ice Corporation, et al.; Dry Ice Corporation of America, et al., Petitioners, vs. Joseph S. Belt, Individually, etc., et al.	The petition for writs of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George F. Thompson for the petitioners, and by Mr. Robert A. Hunter for the respondent in No. 875, and by Mr. Joseph S. Belt for the respondent in No. 876.
875	
876	
Brooklyn Eastern District Terminal, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar R. Houston and Mr. Leonard J. Matteson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General St. Lewis, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Frank Staley, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.
877	

Henry W. Putnam, etc.,
Petitioner,
882 vs.
Lea M. Christie, as Administratrix, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Oscar R. Houston and Mr. George S. Brengle and Mr. Leonard J. Matteson for the petitioner, and by Mr. Russell T. Mount for the respondent.

Philip Elting, Collector of Customs, etc.,
Petitioner,
885 vs.
North German Lloyd.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Bradley B. Gilman for the petitioner, and by Mr. Melville J. France for the respondent.

E. C. Warner Company,
Petitioner,
886 vs.
W. B. Foshay Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John C. Benson and Mr. J. B. Faegre for the petitioner, and by Mr. F. H. Stinchfield for the respondent.

Lighting Fixture Supply Inc.,
Petitioner,
887 vs.
Fidelity Union Fire Insurance Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. St. Clair Adams for the petitioner.

William Grau, Petitioner,
888 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. StephensL. Blakely for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Paul D. Miller, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Boston Iron & Metal Company, et al., Petitioners,
893 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Sylvan Hayes Lauchheimer for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General St. Lewis, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. J. Frank Staley, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the respondent.

Mandel-Witte Company, Inc., et al., Petitioners,
894 vs.
Frederick W. Brooks, Jr., Sole Continuing Partner of the Firm of Brooks and Brooks.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Nathan Ballin for the petitioner, and by Mr. Addison S. Pratt for the respondent.

Mason L. Dean, Individually, etc., et al., Petitioners,
895 vs.
The Jones Store Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Samuel W. Sawyer for the petitioners, and by Mr. Arthur Miller, Mr. Maurice H. Winger, and Mr. Charles W. German for the respondent.

Lloyd Sabaudo Societa Anonima Per Azioni, Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit
902 vs.	Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit
Philip Elting, Collector of Customs of the Port of New York.	was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Delbert M. Tibbetts for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Bradley B. Gilman for the respondent.

Motor Tug "Haakonsen No. 2," etc., Petitioner,	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit
912 vs.	Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit
New York Trap Rock Corporation, et al.	was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George V. A. McCloskey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Frederick W. Park and Mr. Edward Ash for the respondent.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Louis D. Brandeis,
George Sutherland,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. R. E. Wellford, It is ordered that Kendrick Johnson, Esquire, of Reno, State of Nevada, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas E. Turpin, It is ordered that Irving Berkelhammer, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. A. E. Steinem, It is ordered that Albert Blumenstiel, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward P. Costigan, It is ordered that John H. Gabriel, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James Grafton Rogers, It is ordered that Henry C. Vidal, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Huey P. Long, It is ordered that Herve Racivitch, Esquire, of New Orleans, State of Louisiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton E. Hartley, It is ordered that J. Haviland Tompkins, Esquire, of Jersey City, State of New Jersey, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James B. Smith, It is ordered that John J. Welsh, Esquire, of Brooklyn, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hodges, It is ordered that Howard R. Eccleston, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William S. Hodges, It is ordered that Wilber J. Eccleston, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Wesley E. Disney, It is ordered that Philip N. Landa, Esquire, of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Thomas E. Turpin, It is ordered that Carl Bartram Shelley, Esquire, of Steelton, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles H. Bates, It is ordered that J. J. Goshkin, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Joe Crail, It is ordered that Edward M. Auslender, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clarence J. McLeod, It is ordered that Robert J. Evans, Esquire, of Detroit, State of Michigan, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Francis V. S. Oliver, It is ordered that William L. Tierney, Esquire, of Greenwich, State of Connecticut, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William E. Evans, It is ordered that James H. Howard, Esquire, of Los Angeles, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Milton Albert Kallis, It is ordered that Earl B. Dickerson, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Lindley H. Hadley, It is ordered that Charles P. Moriarty, Esquire, of Seattle, State of Washington, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Blaine, It is ordered that Belle Bortin Ruppa, of Milwaukee, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John J. Blaine, It is ordered that Alfred H. Bushnell, Esquire, of Madison, State of Wisconsin, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Samuel M. Shortridge, It is ordered that Syzanne V. Bolles, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and she was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. James M. Beck, It is ordered that Perry J. Ten Hoor, Esquire, of Chicago, State of Illinois, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

George P. Porter, Auditor and Ex-Officio Investment Commissioner of the State of Montana, Appellant, vs. Investors Syndicate. — Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana. — 627

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Montana, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, ~~reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby,~~ reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said District Court for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Roberts.

Jack Hardeman, Petitioner, vs. Albert T. Witbeck. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. — 503

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Louisiana.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste.
Marie Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. James M. Burum. — On writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota.

585

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Minnesota, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Supreme Court, in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

I. Rude, Petitioner, vs. Joseph Buchhalter. — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

736

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, modified as indicated in the opinion of this Court, and, as so modified, affirmed, costs in this Court to be taxed against the respondent.

And it is further ordered that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Atlantic Cleaners and Dyers, Inc.;
Globe Dry Cleaners and Dyers,
Arcade-Sunshine Co., et al., Appellants, vs. The United States of America. 667 — Appeal from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

— Original.

Ex Parte: Winfield A. Green, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

Erie Railroad Company, Petitioner, vs. Michael Duplak, by His Next Friend, Steve Duplak, and Steve Duplak and Annie Duplak, Individuals. 608 — On writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the District of New Jersey for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Sutherland.

George J. Adams and A. W. Kitchin,
Co-Partners, etc., Petitioners,
581 vs. On writ of certiorari to the United
Ogden L. Mills, Director General of States Circuit Court of Appeals for
Railroads, and Union Stock Yard & the Seventh Circuit.
Transit Company.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed with costs; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois with direction to enter judgment for the amount of reparation awarded, with interest, and for reasonable attorney's fees to be fixed by it.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Dissenting: Mr. Justice Butler.

North American Oil Consolidated,
Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the United
575 vs. States Circuit Court of Appeals for
David Burnet, Commissioner of the Ninth Circuit.
Internal Revenue.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the said Circuit Court of Appeals.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

The United States,

Petitioner, On writ of certiorari to the

704 vs. Court of Claims.

Barnim Kombst, Gertrude Luckhardt,

Ilka Wichmann, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that the judgment of the said Court of Claims in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, reversed; and that this cause be, and the same is hereby, remanded to the Court of Claims for further proceedings in conformity with the opinion of this Court.

Per Mr. Justice Brandeis.

Continental Baking Company, General

Baking Company, Schulze Baking

Company, et al., Appellants, Appeal from the District Court of the

677 vs. United States for the District of

Harry H. Woodring, as Governor of Kansas.

the State of Kansas, et al., etc., et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ed Sproles, et al.,

Appellants,

826 vs. Appeal from the District Court of the

T. Binford, Sheriff; O'Brien Stevens, United States for the Southern

District Attorney; R. J. Martin, District of Texas.

Constable, etc., et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Texas, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said District Court in this cause be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Israel Lazar, Appeal from the Court of Quarter

Appellant, Sessions of the Peace of Philadelphia

802 vs. County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Court of Quarter Sessions of the Peace of Philadelphia County, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Kerr Glass Manufacturing Corporation,

Appellant,

818 vs. Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

The Superior Court of the State of State of Washington.

Washington for Kings County and Wm.

J. Steiner, One of the Judges Thereof.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed for the want of jurisdiction.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Kerr Glass Manufacturing Corporation,

Appellant, Appeal from the Supreme Court of the

818 vs. State of Washington.

The Superior Court of the State of

Washington for Kings County, et al., etc.

Treating the appeal papers herein from the Supreme Court of the State of Washington as an application for a writ of certiorari;

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the said application for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jacob Nachman, On consideration of the motion for leave

Petitioner, to proceed in forma pauperis in this

952 vs. cause,

The United States of America. It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jacob Machman, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. 952

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice said:

The other orders of the Court appear upon the list certified by the Chief Justice and filed with the clerk and will not be announced orally.

--- Original.

Ex Parte: The United States, Petitioner.

O R D E R.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of mandamus herein,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that a rule to show cause issue returnable on Monday, October 3, 1932.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

--- Original.

Ex Parte: Krentler-Arnold Hinge Last Company, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file a petition for writ of mandamus herein,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied without prejudice.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—

In re Disbarment of William E. Baff.

The report and recommendation of the committee of the bar of this Court, appointed February 15, 1932, in the above-entitled matter, is received and filed, and the committee is discharged with the thanks of the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

—

In re Disbarment of William E. Baff. ORDER.

A rule having issued, November 2, 1931, against William E. Baff to show cause why he should not be disbarred from the practice of the law in this Court upon the ground of misconduct as shown by proceedings in the United States Patent Office which resulted in his disbarment, March 18, 1921, from the practice of the law before the Patent Office and the denial of his application to be re-registered, March 28, 1929, as a member of the Patent Office Bar; and the said Baff, in response to that rule, having filed an answer, January 29, 1932, challenging the regularity and validity of the proceedings in connection with his disbarment in the United States Patent Office and the denial of his application for re-registration; and this Court, in view of this challenge, being desirous to be advised of the state of the record of the proceedings in the Patent Office, having appointed, by order of February 15, 1932, a Committee of the Bar of this Court to examine and report upon specific inquiries as to the state of the record of the Patent Office in relation to said disbarment and subsequent proceedings, as set forth in said order, and to submit its recommendation as to the final action of this Court; and the report and recommendation of the said Committee having this day been received and filed in this Court,

It is ordered that a copy of the said report and recommendation of the said Committee be served by the Clerk of this Court upon the said William E. Baff, together with this rule; and that the said Baff be, and he is hereby, directed to show cause, on or before Monday, October 3rd next, why, upon the record of his disbarment in the United States Patent Office and of the denial of his application for re-registration, his name should not be stricken from the roll of attorneys admitted to practice before the Bar of this Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Interstate Commerce Commission, et al., Appellants, vs. Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Company, et al.	O R D E R. Further consideration of the question of the jurisdiction of this Court in this case is postponed to the hearing on the merits. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
820	
The Stewart Dry Goods Company, Appellant, vs. John B. Lewis, et al.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
828	
Fred Levy, et al., Appellants, vs. John B. Lewis, et al.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
829	
J. C. Penney Company, Appellant, vs. John B. Lewis, et al.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
830	
Kroger Grocery & Baking Company, Appellant, vs. John B. Lewis, et al.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
831	
Advance-Rumely Thresher Company, Inc., Appellant, vs. A. M. Jackson.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
849	
Girard Life Insurance Company, Appellant vs. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.	In this case probable jurisdiction is noted. Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.
867	

Gertrude C. Solez,
Petitioner,
789 vs.
Zurich General Accident and Liability Insurance Company, Ltd. of Zurich, Switzerland.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sun Oil Company,
Petitioner,
874 vs.
Dalzell Towing Company, Inc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Brooklyn Eastern District Terminal,
Petitioner,
877 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Philip Elting, Collector of Customs, Port of New York,
Petitioner,
885 vs.
North German Lloyd.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Grau,
Petitioner,
888 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lloyd Sabaudo Societa Anonima Per Azioni,
Petitioner,
902 vs.
Philip Elting, Collector of Customs of the Port of New York.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for argument immediately following No. 885, Elting, Collector of Customs vs. North German Lloyd.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hart Glass Manufacturing Company,

Petitioner,

676 vs.

The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hart Glass Manufacturing Company,

Petitioner,

676 vs.

The United States.

On consideration of the motion to remand this case to the Court of Claims for further findings of fact,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

776 vs.

Jacob F. Brown.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jacob F. Brown,

Petitioner,

797 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Kentucky and Indiana Terminal Railroad Company,

Petitioner,

817 vs.

Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

State of Florida, ex rel. Fred H. Davis, etc., et al.,

Petitioners,

859 vs.

Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Florida, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mrs. Rose Cooke Morse,

Petitioner,

870 vs. On petition for writ of certiorari

Jennie G. Lewis, Administratrix of W. D. Lewis, Deceased, Mary Dickinson Julia DeBeale, et al. to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dryice Corporation of America, Dryice Equipment Corporation, et al., Petitioners,

875 vs. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Louisiana Dry Ice Corporation, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Dryice Corporation of America and Dryice Equipment Corporation, Petitioners,

876 vs. On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Joseph S. Belt, Individually and Trading as J. S. Belt Helium Interests, et al.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Henry W. Putnam, for Limitation of and Exemption from Liability as Owner of the Diesel Yacht "Alcyone," her engines, etc., Petitioner,

882 vs.

Lea M. Christie, as Administratrix, etc.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

E. C. Warner Company, Petitioner,

886 vs.

W. B. Peabody Co., C. J. Rockwood, etc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Lighting Fixture Supply, Inc., Petitioner,

887 vs.

Fidelity Union Fire Insurance Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Boston Iron and Metal Company, a Corporation and John D. Roney, Morris Schapiro, Petitioners,
893 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mandel-Witte Company, Inc. and Max Keve, Petitioners,
894 vs.
Frederick W. Brooks, Jr., Sole Continuing Partner of the Firm of Brooks & Brooks.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mason L. Dean, Individually and as Trustee, etc., et al., Petitioners,
895 vs.
The Jones Store Company.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Motor Tug Haakonsen No. 2, etc.,

Petitioner,

912 vs.

New York Trap Rock Corporation, Daniel Roe Towing & Transportation Co., Inc., et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

OCTOBER TERM, 1931

WAIVER BY THE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE RIGHT TO OPPOSE PETITIONS FOR WRITS OF CERTIORARI IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Now comes the Solicitor General and waives the right to oppose petitions for writs of certiorari in all criminal cases docketed on or after this day, up to and including Friday, May 27th next, and moves the Court that all petitions for writs of certiorari in criminal prosecutions to which this waiver applies be submitted to the Court on the day of the filing of the petition.

Dated: May 23rd, 1932.

Thomas D. Thacher, Solicitor General.

ORDER.

The Court directs that all petitions for writs of certiorari in criminal prosecutions filed on or before Friday, May 27th next, to which the Government's waiver applies, shall be deemed to be submitted to the Court at the time of the filing of the petition, and the Clerk is directed thereupon to distribute the petition and accompanying papers to the members of the Court.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William H. Rhodes, et al., Appellants,

865 vs.

E. L. Twing, et al.;

C. I. Williams, et al., Appellants,

866 vs.

H. C. Speer, et al.

On consideration of the motion for leave to file out of time the statements as to jurisdiction in these cases,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ozie Powell, et al., Petitioners,

981 vs.

The State of Alabama;

Haywood Patterson, Petitioner,

982 vs.

The State of Alabama;

Charlie Weems and Clarence Norris, Petitioners,

983 vs.

The State of Alabama.

On consideration of the motion by counsel for the respondent that the petition for writs of certiorari in these cases be ordered submitted with leave to respondent to file a brief on or before Friday, next,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Southern Railway Co., Appellant,

300 vs.

Commonwealth of Kentucky;

Andrew W. Mellon, Director General of Railroads, Appellant,

301 vs.

Commonwealth of Kentucky.

On consideration of the motion to stay the mandates in these cases,

It is ordered by this Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and that the mandates in these cases be, and the same are hereby, stayed until the further order of the Court.

The Alton Railroad Company,
Appellant,
956 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The motion to advance this case was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George E. Hamilton, Jr., for the appellant.

National Surety Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
727 vs.
Valeria E. Coriell, et al.

The suggestion of a diminution of the record and motion for writ of certiorari herein were submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gregory Hankin for the petitioners.

Rafael Cortes, as Administrator, etc.,
Petitioner,
752 vs.
Baltimore Insular Line, Inc.

The motion for leave to proceed further herein in forma pauperis was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Basil O'Connor for the petitioner.

The Alton Railroad Company,
Appellant,
956 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

The statement as to jurisdiction herein was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Silas H. Strawn and Mr. Frank H. Towner for the appellant.

Meyer Hecht,
Petitioner,
862 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Herbert Smyth and Mr. Frederic C. Scofield for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Ralph C. Williamson, Mr. Bradley B. Gilman, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Colonial Trust Company, Executor, etc., Petitioner,
871 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. C. Cochran, Jr., for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, and Mr. H. Brian Holland for the respondent.

Sevier Commission Company, et al., Petitioners,
884 vs.
Wallowa National Bank, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. James G. Wilson and Mr. John F. Reilly for the petitioners, and by Mr. Robert Treat Platt and Mr. Harrison G. Platt for the respondent.

Grace S. Arkenburgh, Individually, etc., Petitioner,
896 vs.
The Bank of Vass.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Donald Meyer Newman for the petitioner.

City National Bank of Wichita Falls, Texas, Petitioner,
898 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John B. King for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. J. P. Jackson, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Elliot C. Grandin, Administrator, etc., Petitioner,
899 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Maynard Teall for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. J. Louis Monarch, and Mr. Erwin N. Griswold for the respondent.

Van Camp Sea Food Co., Inc., Petitioner,
901 vs.
Cohn-Hopkins, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert J. Wihe for the petitioner, and by Mr. William S. Graham for the respondents.

Doane-Commercial Towing Company, Petitioner,
903 vs.
Mexican Petroleum Corporation.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Albert T. Gould for the petitioner, and by Mr. Edward S. Dodge and Mr. Nathan W. Thompson for the respondent.

Oscar M. Gwin, Trading as O. M. Gwin Construction Company, Petitioner,
904 vs.
Peter Jung, Sr., et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Purnell M. Milner for the petitioner, and by Mr. Peter Jung, Sr., et al., pro se.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner,
905 vs.
Harry L. Martin.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edward T. Miller and Mr. Alexander P. Stewart for the petitioner, and by Mr. W. H. Douglass for the respondent.

Texas Steel Company, Petitioner,
906 vs.
Railroad Commission of Texas, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, Third Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George W. Armstrong for the petitioner, and by Mr. and William E. Allen, Fred L. Wallace/for the respondent railway companies.

Angelus Building & Investment Company, Petitioner,
909 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George Bouchard and Mr. Joseph B. Brady for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. A. H. Conner, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

The City of South Norfolk, et al., Petitioners,
910 vs.
Maryland Casualty Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. E. A. Bilisoly, Mr. Tazewell Taylor, Jr., and Mr. James G. Martin for the petitioners, and by Mr. Branden Vandeventer and Mr. J. W. Eggleston for the respondent.

Hubert Dalton and Florence W. Dalton, Petitioners,
911 vs.
Frank C. Bowers, as Executor, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Arnold Lichtig for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John Henry McEvers for the respondent.

Arthur J. Stevens, as Sole Receiver, etc., Petitioner,
914 vs.
Compania Petrolera Capuchinas, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Francis L. Kohlman, Mr. Martin Conboy, and Mr. Saul J. Lance for the petitioner, and by Mr. William M. Chadbourne for the respondents.

Mary M. Lee, Executrix, etc., Petitioner,
915 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. John E. Laskey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. Hayner N. Larson, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the respondent.

Illinois Terminal Company, Petitioner,
917 vs.
The United States.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Adrian C. Humphreys and Mr. Newton K. Fox for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Rugg, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Joseph M. Sheppard, Mr. Bradley B. Gilman, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Florence S. Schuette,
Petitioner,
918 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, Collector of Internal Revenue, etc.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Gerald Donovan for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. F. Edward Mitchell for the respondent.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company,
Petitioner,
919 vs.
Charlie Thomas.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. C. W. Strickling for the petitioner, and by Mr. A. A. Lilly for the respondent.

Cesaro Sgro,
Petitioner,
920 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Irving K. Baxter for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Paul D. Miller, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

General Electric Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
922 vs.
The Marvel Rare Metals Company, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Lawrence Bristol and Mr. Charles Neave for the petitioners, and by Mr. Harold Kline Smith for the respondents.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
923 vs.
R. E. Huff, Individually, et al.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Harry C. Weeks for the respondents.

The United States,
Petitioner,
925 vs.
Flensburger Dampfercompagnie.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. Maxwell C. Katz, Mr. Otto C. Sommerich, and Mr. Edwin M. Borchard for the respondent.

Erlanger Tremont Theatre Corporation,
Petitioner,
927 vs.
Evelyn Ellsmore.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Romney Spring for the petitioner, and by Mr. George R. Farnum for the respondent.

J. B. Davis,
Petitioner,
931 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William J. Berne for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. John S. Pratt, Mr. Paul D. Miller, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

W. W. Easterday, et al.,
Petitioners,
933 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. W. W. Easterday pro se, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Paul D. Miller, and Mr. William H. Riley, Jr., for the respondent.

Frank C. Ferguson, Collector of Internal Revenue,
Petitioner,
942 vs.
Harry R. Nelson.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the petitioner, and by Mr. William P. Chapman, Jr., for the respondent.

Elmer Lawrence,
Petitioner,
943 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Edwin W. Sims, Mr. Franklin J. Stransky, and Mr. Cassius Poust for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Paul D. Miller, Mr. Erwin N. Griswold, and Mr. Hugh A. Fisher for the respondent.

The Greater City Surety and Indemnity Corporation and John Kelleher,
Petitioners,
944 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Louis B. Boudin for the petitioners, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Paul D. Miller, Mr. John J. Byrne, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

William Finn, et al.,
Petitioners,
949 vs.
Railroad Commission of the State of California.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. T. C. West for the petitioners.

Arthur J. Fournier,
Petitioner,
951 vs.
The United States of America.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. Warner Parker for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Paul D. Miller, and Mr. W. Marvin Smith for the respondent.

Murphy Oil Company,
Petitioner,
955 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Randolph E. Paul and Mr. Thomas R. Dempsey for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, Mr. J. P. Jackson, and Mr. Wilbur H. Friedman for the respondent.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
958 vs.
Zallie N. Booth.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Welles V. Moot for the petitioner, and by Mr. Hamilton Ward for the respondent.

Sam Comeriato, et al., Petitioners, 961 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. J. Raymond Gordon for the petitioners.
George Biemer, Petitioner, 968 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Frederick W. Greene for the petitioner.
Standard Accident Insurance Company of Detroit, Michigan, Inc., Petitioner, 969 vs. Lillian M. Messervey.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Thomas B. Wheeler for the petitioner, and by Mr. William B. Mahoney for the respondent.
Rosario Pellegrino, Petitioner, 970 vs. A. C. Aderhold, Warden, etc.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. A. K. Shipe for the petitioner.
Morris Heller, Petitioner, 974 vs. The United States of America.	The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Giles F. Clark for the petitioner.

Mary Roxburghe,

Petitioner,

975 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. George M. Morris and Frederick L. Pearce, for the petitioner, and by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. John Mac C. Hudson for the respondent.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue,

Petitioner,

977 vs.

Commonwealth Improvement Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant Attorney General Youngquist, Mr. Whitney North Seymour, Mr. Sewall Key, and Mr. Morton K. Rothschild for the petitioner, and by Mr. Ellis Ames Ballard for the respondent.

The United States of America,

Petitioner,

978 vs.

Great Northern Railway Company.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher, Mr. Assistant to the Attorney General O'Brian, Mr. Elmer Collins, Mr. Chas. H. Weston, and Mr. F. G. Dorety for the petitioner, and by Mr. R. J. Hagman, Mr. W. W. Millan, and Mr. R. E. L. Smith for the respondent.

James A. Cresswell, ex rel. Philip Di Pierro,

Petitioner,

980 vs.

Anna C. M. Tillinghast, United States Commissioner of Immigration.

The petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was submitted to the consideration of the Court by Mr. William H. Lewis and Mr. Matthew L. McGrath for the petitioner, and right to file brief in opposition was waived by Mr. Solicitor General Thacher for the respondent.

Pursuant to adjournment the Court met at the Capitol.

PRESENT:

The Honorable Charles E. Hughes, Chief Justice,
Willis Van Devanter,
Louis D. Brandeis,
Pierce Butler,
Harlan F. Stone, Associate Justices.
Owen J. Roberts,
Benjamin N. Cardozo,
Frank K. Green, Esquire, Marshal,
Charles Elmore Cropley, Clerk.

Proclamation being made the Court is opened.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Hugh Reid, It is ordered that Gaspare M. Cusumano, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Edward T. Fenwick, It is ordered that Millard H. Patterson, Esquire, of Miami, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Randolph C. Shaw, It is ordered that Frederick C. Madara, Esquire, of Ridgely, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frederick W. Dallinger, It is ordered that M. Leo Looney, Jr., Esquire, of Boston, State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Harry Friedman, It is ordered that Harry Tabershaw, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Paul M. Segal, It is ordered that David J. Colton, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. U. Bon Geaslin, It is ordered that Thomas J. Cole, Esquire, of St. Louis, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. P. Michael Cook, It is ordered that Joseph L. Pinkasiewicz, Esquire, of McKeesport, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., It is ordered that Matthew J. Lyons, Esquire, of New York City, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Clinton R. Colvin, It is ordered that J. Yandell Blakely, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. George H. Carter, It is ordered that Carl L. Ristine, Esquire, of Lexington, State of Missouri, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William J. Hughes, Jr., It is ordered that Edward Widdifield, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Rigby, It is ordered that Paul S. Jones, Esquire, of Marietta, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William C. Rigby, It is ordered that Butler L. Knight, Esquire, of San Antonio, State of Texas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Charles M. Galloway, It is ordered that Benjamin J. Brooks, Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Maurice D. Rosenberg, It is ordered that Herman Wollitzer, Esquire, of Jackson Heights, State of New York, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. William R. Eaton, It is ordered that Harry C. Saunders, Esquire, of Denver, State of Colorado, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Everett Sanders, It is ordered that Robe Carl White, Esquire, of Muncie, State of Indiana, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Homer Hoch, It is ordered that Karl Miller, Esquire, of Dodge City, State of Kansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Heartsill Ragon, It is ordered that Nicholas J. Gantt, Jr., Esquire, of Pine Bluff, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Heartsill Ragon, It is ordered that Alexander M. Rowell, Esquire, of Pine Bluff, State of Arkansas, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. John Lord O'Brian, It is ordered that Russell Hardy, Esquire, of Hyattsville, State of Maryland, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Horace T. Jones, It is ordered that Alfred M. Barlow, Esquire, of Cleveland, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Preston B. Kavanaugh, It is ordered that Preston C. King, Jr., Esquire, of Washington, District of Columbia, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that Robert D. Scholes, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Phil D. Swing, It is ordered that John L. Murphy, Esquire, of San Francisco, State of California, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. C. Ellis Moore, It is ordered that John Kirker Sawyers, Jr., Esquire, of Woodsfield, State of Ohio, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Frank J. Albus, It is ordered that Raymond Charles Weber, Esquire, of Easton, State of Pennsylvania, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sam C. Bratton, It is ordered that Robert C. Simmons, Esquire, of Covington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sam C. Bratton, It is ordered that Richard T. Von Hoene, Esquire, of Covington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Sam C. Bratton, It is ordered that Charlton B. Thompson, Esquire, of Covington, State of Kentucky, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

On motion first made to the Court in this behalf by Mr. Park Trammell, It is ordered that E. R. Craig, Esquire, of Winter Haven, State of Florida, be admitted to practice as an Attorney and Counsellor of this Court, and he was sworn accordingly.

19 Original,

Ex Parte: The State of Colorado, Petitioner.

On petition for writ of Mandamus.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of mandamus herein and of the return to the rule to show cause thereupon issued,

It is ordered and adjudged by this Court as follows: Should the district judge deem it proper to do so, he may permit the accused by amendment to his petition and additional evidence or otherwise to show that he is entitled to removal authorized by section 33 of the Judicial Code, as amended. If such permission be denied or if, leave being granted, petitioner shall fail to meet the requirements of that section, the case is to be remanded to the State court as upon a peremptory writ of mandamus.

Per Mr. Justice Butler.

Mr. Justice Stone and Mr. Justice Cardozo think the rule should be discharged.

The State of Wyoming,

Complainant,

15, Original. vs.

The State of Colorado.

This cause came on to be heard on the motion to dismiss the bill of complaint herein, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, it is ordered by this Court that the motion to dismiss be, and the same is hereby, overruled, with leave to Wyoming to amend her bill within 30 days by making some of its allegations more definite and certain, if she be so advised, and permitting Colorado to answer the bill or amended bill, as the case may be, on or before the 1st day of September, next.

Per Mr. Justice Van Devanter.

Gregg Dyeing Company,

Appellant,

170 vs.

W. G. Query, J. P. Derham, and F. C. Robinson, Personally and as Members of South Carolina Tax Commission.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The City of Greenville, etc., et al.,

Appellants,

245 vs.

W. G. Query, J. P. Derham, and Frank C. Robinson, Constituting the State Tax Commission of the State of South Carolina.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered, adjudged, and decreed by this Court that the decree of the said Supreme Court, in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, affirmed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Thomas C. Edwards, On a certificate from the

790 vs. Court of Claims.

The United States.

This cause came on to be heard on a certificate from the Court of Claims, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is the opinion of this Court that the question certified must be answered in the affirmative.

Whereupon, It is now here ordered by this Court that it be so certified to the said Court of Claims.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chief Justice announced the following orders of the Court:

Franklin-American Trust Company, On writ of certiorari to the United

Petitioner, States Circuit Court of Appeals for

455 vs. the Eighth Circuit.

St. Louis Union Trust Company, et al.

This cause came on to be heard on the transcript of the record from the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, and was argued by counsel.

On consideration whereof, It is now here ordered by this Court that the writ of certiorari in this cause, be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mr. Justice Brandeis dissents from this order of the Court.

The Texas and Pacific Railway, et al.,

Appellants,

24 vs. O R D E R.

The United States of America, et al.

This cause is restored to the docket for reargument upon all questions involved, and the attention of counsel is invited to the question whether the respective relations of the Louisiana ports and the Texas ports to the export, import and coastwise traffic affected, and to the rates condemned, by the orders in controversy are such that the Louisiana ports may be regarded as localities unduly or unreasonably preferred by such rates within the sense and meaning of sections 3 (1) and 15 (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act and that the Texas ports may be regarded as localities unduly or unreasonably prejudiced by such rates within the sense and meaning of the same sections.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Finn, Mary A. Finn and Geo. W. Crawford, Petitioners, On petition for writ of certiorari

949 vs. to the Supreme Court of the

Railroad Commission of the State of California. State of California.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of California, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied because not filed within the time provided by law.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

James A. Cresswell, ex rel.
Philip Di Pierro, alias,

Petitioner,

980 vs.

Anna G. M. Tillinghast, United States Commissioner of Immigration.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied because not filed within the time provided by law.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

ORDER.

It is ordered that the following rules of this Court, and parts thereof, be, and they are hereby, amended, effective Sept. 1, 1932, in accordance with the draft thereof certified by the Chief Justice and this day filed with the Clerk of this Court: Rule 2, paragraph 5; Rule 7, paragraph 3; Rule 10, paragraphs 1 and 2; Rule 12; Rule 13, paragraphs 2 and 9; Rule 38, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4; Rule 41, paragraphs 4 and 5; Rule 46, paragraph 2.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

RULE 2, PARAGRAPH 5

Where it is shown to the court that any member of its bar has been disbarred from practice in any State, Territory, District, or insular possession, or has been guilty of conduct unbecoming a member of the bar of this court, he will be forthwith suspended from practice before this court, and unless, upon notice mailed to him at the address shown in the clerk's records and to the clerk of the highest court of the State, Territory, District, or insular possession to which he belongs, he shows good cause to the contrary within 40 days he will be disbarred.

RULE 7, PARAGRAPH 3

No motion by respondent to dismiss a petition for writ of certiorari will be received. Objections to the jurisdiction of the court to grant writs of certiorari may be included in briefs in opposition to petitions therefor.

A motion by appellee to dismiss an appeal will be received in advance of the court's ruling upon the jurisdictional statements only when presented in the manner provided by rule 12, paragraph 3. When such a motion is made, the appellant shall have 20 days after service upon him within which to file in this court 40 printed copies of a brief opposing the motion, except that where his counsel resides in California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Idaho, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, or an outlying possession, the time shall be 25 days.

A motion by respondent to dismiss a writ of certiorari or by appellee to dismiss an appeal, after the court has ruled upon the jurisdictional statements and accompanying motions, if any (rule 12, paragraph 5), will be received if not based upon grounds already advanced in opposition to the granting of the writ of certiorari or to the noting of jurisdiction of the appeal. Such motions, together with motions to dismiss certificates in case of questions certified, must be printed and 40 copies thereof must be filed with the clerk, accompanied by proof that a copy of the motion, and accompanying brief, if any, have been served upon counsel of record for the opposing party. The opposing party shall have 20 days from the date of such service within which to file a printed brief opposing the motion. When counsel for the opposing party resides in California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Idaho, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, or an outlying possession, the time shall be 25 days. Upon the filing of the opposing brief, or the expiration of the time allowed therefor, or express waiver of the right to file, the motion and briefs thereon shall be distributed by the clerk to the court for its consideration.

The pendency of a motion to dismiss or affirm shall not preclude the placing of the cause upon the calendar of the court for oral argument or its being called for argument when reached.

RULE 10, PARAGRAPH 1

When an appeal is allowed a citation to the appellee shall be signed by the judge or justice allowing the appeal and shall be made returnable not exceeding 40 days from the day of signing the citation, whether the return day fall in vacation or in term time, except in appeals from California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Idaho, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana, when the time shall be 60 days. The citation must be served before the return day.

RULE 10, PARAGRAPH 2

The clerk of the court from which an appeal to this court may be allowed, shall make and transmit to this court under his hand and the seal of the court a true copy of the material parts of the record, always including the assignment of errors, and any opinions delivered in the case.

To enable the clerk to perform such duty and for the purpose of reducing the size of transcripts and eliminating all papers not necessary to the consideration of the questions to be reviewed, it shall be the duty of the appellant, or his counsel, to file with the clerk of the lower court, together with proof or acknowledgment of service of a copy on the appellee, or his counsel, a praecipe indicating the portions of the record to be incorporated into the transcript. Should the appellee, or his counsel, desire additional portions of the record incorporated into the transcript he or his counsel shall file with the clerk of the lower court his praecipe, within ten days thereafter (unless the time be enlarged by a judge of the lower court or a justice of this court), indicating the additional portions of the record desired to be included. See Equity Rules, 75–77, 226 U. S., Appendix, p. 28, and 286 U. S. —.

The clerk of the lower court shall transmit to this court as the transcript of the record only the portions of the record covered by such designations.

The parties or their counsel may by written stipulation filed with the clerk of the lower court indicate the portions of the record to be included in the transcript, and the clerk shall then transmit only the parts designated in such stipulation.

In all cases the clerk shall include in the transcript all papers filed under authority of rule 12. See Rule 12, paragraph 4.

If this court shall find that any portion of the record unnecessary to a proper presentation of the case has been incorporated into the transcript at the instance of either party, the whole or any part of the cost of printing and the clerk's fee for supervising the printing may be ordered to be paid by the offending party.

RULE 12

Jurisdiction of this Court to review upon appeal

1. Upon the presentation of a petition for the allowance of an appeal to this court, from any court, to any judge or justice empowered by law to allow it, there shall be presented by the applicant a separate typewritten statement particularly disclosing the basis upon which it is contended that this court has jurisdiction upon appeal to review the judgment or decree in question. The statement shall refer distinctly (*a*) to the statutory provision believed to sustain the jurisdiction, (*b*) to the statute of the state, or statute or treaty of the United States, the validity of which is involved (giving the volume and page where the statute or treaty may be found in the official edition), setting it out verbatim or appropriately summarizing its pertinent provisions; and (*c*) to the date of judgment or decree sought to be reviewed and the date upon which the application for appeal is presented. The statement shall show that the nature of the case and of the rulings of the court was such as to bring the case within the jurisdictional provision relied on, and shall cite the cases believed to sustain the jurisdiction.

If the appeal is from an interlocutory decree of a specially constituted District Court of the United States (Judicial Code, sec. 266; U. S. C., tit. 28, sec. 380), the statement must also include a showing of the matters in which it is claimed that the court has abused its discretion in granting or denying the interlocutory injunction. (*Alabama* v. *United States*, 279 U. S. 229.)

2. If the appeal is allowed, the appellant shall serve upon the appellee within five days after such allowance (*a*) a copy of the petition for and order allowing the appeal, together with a copy of the assignments of error and of the statement required by paragraph 1 of this rule, and (*b*) a statement directing attention to the provisions of paragraph 3 of this rule. Proof of service of the papers required by this paragraph to be served shall be filed forthwith with the clerk of the court possessed of the record, and shall be incorporated by him in the transcript of record prepared for this court upon the appeal.

3. Within 15 days after such service the appellee may file with the clerk of the court possessed of the record, and serve upon the appellant, a typewritten statement disclosing any matter or ground making against the jurisdiction of this court asserted by the appellant. There may be included in, or filed with, such opposing statement, a motion by appellee to dismiss or affirm. Where such a motion is made, it may be opposed as provided in rule 7, paragraph 3.

4. The clerk of the court possessed of the record shall include the statements and motions, required and permitted to be filed under the provisions of this rule, in the transcript of record prepared for the use of this court on the appeal, anything in the præcipes or stipulations of the parties (rule 10, paragraph 2) to the contrary notwithstanding.

5. After the case shall have been docketed in this court by the appellant, and the transcript of record filed (rule 11, paragraph 1), the clerk of this court shall forthwith print the appellant's statement required by paragraph 1 of this rule and the opposing statement, and motions, if any, permitted by paragraph 3 of this rule, and the clerk shall thereupon distribute such printed papers to the court for its consideration.

At the time of docketing the case the appellant shall make such cash deposit with the clerk, in addition to such deposit as may be required under rule 13, paragraph 1, as shall be necessary to defray the cost of printing 40 copies of his statement filed pursuant to paragraph 1 of this rule; and the appellee, upon demand, shall forthwith deposit with the clerk a sum sufficient to cover the cost of printing 40 copies of any statement or motions filed under paragraph 3 of this rule.

6. If either appellant or appellee fails to comply with the provisions of this rule, the clerk of this court shall report such failure to the court immediately so that this court may take such action as it deems proper.

RULE 13, PARAGRAPH 2

Immediately after the designation of the parts of the record to be printed or the expiration of the time allotted therefor (see paragraph 9 of this rule), the clerk shall make an estimate of the cost of printing the record, his fee for preparing it for the printer and supervising the printing, and other probable fees, and shall furnish the same to the party docketing the case. If such estimated sum be not paid on or before a date designated by the clerk of this court in each case, it shall be the duty of the clerk to report that fact to the court, whereupon the cause will be dismissed, unless good cause to the contrary is shown.

RULE 13, PARAGRAPH 9

When the record is filed, or within five days thereafter, the appellant shall file with the clerk a definite statement of the points on which he intends to rely and of the parts of the record which he thinks necessary for the consideration thereof, with proof of service of the same on the adverse party. The adverse party, within 10 days after service of the statement and designation required to be filed by appellant may designate in writing, filed with the clerk, additional parts of the record which he thinks material; and, if he shall not do so, he shall be held to have consented to a hearing on the parts designated by the appellant. The parts of the records so designated by one or both of the parties, and only those parts, shall be printed by the clerk. The statement of points intended to be relied upon and the designations of the parts of the record to be printed shall be printed by the clerk with the record. He shall, however, omit all duplication, all repetition of titles, and all other obviously unimportant matter, and make proper note thereof. The court will consider nothing but the points of law so stated and the parts of the record so designated. If at the hearing it shall appear that any material part of the record has not been printed, the appeal may be dismissed or such other order made as the circumstances may appear to the court to require. If either party shall have caused unnecessary parts of the record to be printed, such order as to costs may be made as the court shall think proper.

The fees of the clerk under rule 32, paragraph 6, shall be computed on the folios in the record as filed, and shall be in full for the performance of his duties in that regard.

RULE 38, PARAGRAPH 2

The petition shall contain only a summary and short statement of the matter involved and the reasons relied on for the allowance of the writ. A supporting brief may be included in the petition, but, whether so included or presented separately, it must be direct, concise, and in conformity with rules 26 and 27. A failure to comply with these requirements will be a sufficient reason for denying the petition. See *United States* v. *Rimer*, 220 U. S. 547; *Furness, Withy & Co.* v. *Yang Tze Insurance Assn.*, 242 U. S. 430; *Houston Oil Co.* v. *Goodrich*, 245 U. S. 440; *Layne & Bowler Corporation* v. *Western Well Works*, 261 U. S. 387, 392; *Magnum Import Co.* v. *Coty*, 262 U. S. 159, 163; *Southern Power Co.* v. *North Carolina Public Service Co.*, 263 U. S. 508. Forty printed copies of the petition and supporting brief shall be filed. The petition will be deemed in time when it, the record, and the supporting brief, are filed with the clerk within the period prescribed by section 8 of the act of February 13, 1925.

RULE 38, PARAGRAPH 3 (A)

If the date for filing a brief in opposition falls in the summer recess, the brief may be filed within 40 days after the service of the notice, but this enlargement shall not extend the time to a later date than September 10.

RULE 38, PARAGRAPH 4

Upon the expiration of the period for filing the respondent's brief, or upon an express waiver of the right to file or the actual filing of such brief in a shorter time, the petition, record, and briefs shall be distributed by the clerk to the court for its consideration.

RULE 41, PARAGRAPH 4

A petition to this court for a writ of certiorari to review a judgment of the Court of Claims shall be accompanied by a certified transcript of the record in that court, consisting of the pleadings, findings of fact, judgment and opinion of the court, but not the evidence. The petition shall contain only a summary and short statement of the matter involved and the reasons relied on for the allowance of the writ, but may be accompanied by a brief to conform to rules 26 and 27 as to form. The petition, brief, and record shall be filed with the clerk and 40 copies shall be printed under his supervision. The record shall be printed in the same way and upon the same terms that records on appeal are required to be printed. The estimated costs of printing shall be paid within five days after the estimate is furnished by the clerk and if payment is not so made the petition may be summarily dismissed. When the petition, brief, and record are printed the petitioner shall forthwith serve copies thereof on the respondent, or his counsel of record, and shall file with the clerk due proof thereof.

RULE 41, PARAGRAPH 5

Within 20 days after the petition, brief, and record are served the respondent may file with the clerk 40 printed copies of an opposing brief, conforming to rules 26 and 27. Upon the expiration of that period, or upon an express waiver of the right to file or the actual filing of such brief in a shorter time, the petition, briefs, and record shall be distributed by the clerk to the court for its consideration.

The provision of subdivision (a) of paragraph 3 of rule 38 shall apply to briefs in opposition to petitions for writs of certiorari to review judgments of the Court of Claims.

RULE 48, PARAGRAPH 2

Under the act of January 31, 1928, as amended by the act of April 26, 1928, the review which theretofore could be had in this court on writ of error may now be obtained on an appeal. But the appeal thereby substituted for a writ of error must be sought, allowed, and perfected in conformity with the statutes theretofore providing for a writ of error. The appeal can be allowed only on the presentation of a petition showing that the case is one in which, under the legislation in force when the act of January 31, 1928, was passed, a review could be had in this court on writ of error. The petition must be accompanied by an assignment of errors (see rule 9), and statement as to jurisdiction (see rule 12), and the judge or justice allowing the appeal must take proper security for costs and sign the requisite citation to the appellee. See paragraph 1 of rule 10 and paragraph 1 of rule 36. The citation must be served on the appellee or his counsel and filed, with proof of service, with the clerk of the court in which the judgment to be reviewed was entered. The mode of obtaining a supersedeas is pointed out in paragraph 2 of rule 36.

ORDER

Paragraph (b) of rule 75 of the rules of practice in equity heretofore promulgated by this Court (226 U. S., Appendix) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The evidence to be included in the record, except expert testimony, shall not be set forth in full, but shall be stated in simple and condensed form, all parts not essential to the decision of the questions presented by the appeal being omitted and the testimony of witnesses being stated only in narrative form, save that if either party desires it, and the court or judge so directs, any part of the testimony shall be reproduced in the exact words of the witness. The duty of so condensing and stating the evidence shall rest primarily on the appellant, who shall prepare his statement thereof and lodge the same in the clerk's office for the examination of the other parties at or before the time of filing his praecipe under paragraph (*a*) of this rule. He shall also notify the other parties or their solicitors of such lodgment and shall name a time and place when he will ask the court or judge to approve the statement, the time so named to be at least ten days after such notice. At the expiration of the time named or such further time as the court or judge may allow, the statement, together with any objections made or amendments proposed by any party, shall be presented to the court or the judge, and if the statement be true, complete and properly prepared, it shall be approved by the court or judge, and if it be not true, complete, or properly prepared, it shall be made so under the direction of the court or judge and shall then be approved. When approved, it shall be filed in the clerk's office and become a part of the record for the purposes of the appeal."

ORDER

The rules of practice in equity heretofore promulgated by this Court (226 U. S., Appendix) are amended by including therein a new rule numbered 61½ and reading as follows:

"In all references to a master, either compulsorily by the court in cases where it has the power to make compulsory reference, or by consent of parties where consent is necessary, whether the reference be of all issues of law and fact, or only particular issues either of law or fact or both, the report of the master shall be treated as presumptively correct, but shall be subject to review by the court, and the court may adopt the same, or may modify or reject the same in whole or in part when the court in the exercise of its judgment is fully satisfied that error has been committed: *Provided*, That when a case or any issue is referred by consent and the intention is plainly expressed in the consent order that the submission is to the master as an arbitrator, the court may review the same only in accordance with the principles governing a review of an award and decision by an arbitrator."

ORDER

The rules of practice in admiralty heretofore promulgated by this Court (254 U. S., Appendix) are amended by including therein a new rule numbered 43½ and reading as follows:

"In all references to commissioners or assessors, by consent or otherwise, whether the reference be of all issues of law and fact, or only particular issues either of law or fact or both, the report of the commissioners or assessors shall be treated as presumptively correct, but shall be subject to review by the court, and the court may adopt the same, or may modify or reject the same in whole or in part when the court in the exercise of its judgment is fully satisfied that error has been committed: *Provided*, That when a case or any issue is referred by consent and the intention is plainly expressed in the consent order that the submission is to the commissioners or assessors as arbitrators, the court may review the same only in accordance with the principles governing a review of an award and decision by an arbitrator."

ORDER

The General Orders in Bankruptcy heretofore promulgated by this Court are amended by including therein a new order, numbered XLVII, and reading as follows:

"The reports of referees in all cases and proceedings in bankruptcy shall be deemed presumptively correct, but shall be subject to review by the court, and the court may adopt the same, or may modify or reject the same in whole or in part when the court in the exercise of its judgment is fully satisfied that error has been committed: *Provided*, That when any matter is referred by consent of all parties in interest and the intention is plainly expressed in the consent order that the submission is to the referee as an arbitrator, the court may review the same only in accordance with the principles governing a review of an award and decision by an arbitrator."

The Chief Justice said:

The other orders of the Court appear upon the list certified by the Chief Justice and filed with the clerk and will not be announced orally.

— Original.

Ex parte: John W. Keogh, Petitioner.

On consideration of the motion that jurisdiction be assumed in this cause,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Rafael Cortes, as Administrator, etc., Petitioner,

752 vs.

Baltimore Insular Line, Inc.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed further herein in forma pauperis,

It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

National Surety Company, et al.,
Petitioners,
727 vs.
Valeria E. Coriell, et al.

On consideration of the suggestion of a diminution of the record and motion for a writ of certiorari in this cause, It is ordered by the Court that the said motion be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Alton Railroad Company,
Appellant.
956 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

In this cause probable jurisdiction is noted.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Alton Railroad Company,
Appellant,
956 vs.
The United States of America, et al.

On consideration of the motion to advance this cause, It is now here ordered by the Court that said motion be, and the same is hereby, granted, and the cause assigned for argument on Monday, October 10, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

William Grau,
Petitioner,
888 vs.
The United States of America.

ORDER.

It is ordered that this case be advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 10, next.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Cesaro Sgro,
Petitioner,
920 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th next.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Jack Gebardi and Louise Rolfe Gebardi, Petitioners,
979 vs.
The United States of America.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 10 next.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Ozie Powell, Willie Roberson, Andy Wright, Olen Montgomery, Eugene Williams, Petitioners,
981 vs.
The State of Alabama.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th next.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Haywood Patterson, Petitioner,
982 vs.
The State of Alabama.

Order allowing certiorari.
The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th next.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Charlie Weems and Clarence Norris, Petitioners,
983 vs.
The State of Alabama.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Alabama is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th next.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States of America, Petitioner,
978 vs.
Great Northern Railway Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit is granted, and the case is advanced and assigned for argument on Monday, October 10th next.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Doane-Commercial Towing Company, Petitioner,
903 vs.
Mexican Petroleum Corporation.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for argument immediately following case No. 877, Brooklyn Eastern District Terminal vs. The United States of America.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sevier Commission Company, Hartford Accident and Indemnity Company of Hartford, Connecticut, Petitioners,

884 vs.

Wallowa National Bank, a National Banking Corporation.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Hubert Dalton and Florence W. Dalton, Petitioners,

911 vs.

Frank C. Bowers, as Executor of the Last Will and Testament of Frank K. Bowers, etc.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

General Electric Company and Carboloy Company, Inc., Petitioners,

922 vs.

The Marvel Rare Metals Company, The Ohio Instrument Manufacturing Company, et al.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
923 vs.
R. E. Huff, Individually and R. E. Huff, and Wm. E. Huff, Independent Executors of the Estate of Mrs. E. B. Huff, Deceased.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Murphy Oil Company, Petitioner,
955 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is granted. And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Petitioner,
977 vs.
Commonwealth Improvement Company.

Order allowing certiorari.

The petition herein for a writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is granted, and the case is assigned for argument immediately following case No. 911, Dalton vs. Bowers, as Executor.

And it is further ordered that the duly certified copy of the transcript of the proceedings below which accompanied the petition shall be treated as though filed in response to such writ.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Meyer Hecht,

Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

862 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Colonial Trust Company, Executor of the Will of Glenn T. Braden, Deceased, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari

871 vs. to the Court of Claims.

The United States.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Grace S. Arkenburgh, Individually and as Trustee under the Last Will and Testament of Emily Salmon, Deceased, Petitioner, On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court

896 vs. of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

The Bank of Vass.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

City National Bank of Wichita Falls, Texas,
Petitioner,
898 vs.
Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Elliot C. Grandin, Administrator, D. B. N., C. T. A. of the Last Will of William James Grandin, Deceased,
Petitioner,
899 vs.
D. B. Heiner, Collector of Internal Revenue for the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Van Camp Sea Food Co., Inc.,
Petitioner,
901 vs.
Cohn-Hopkins, Westgate Sea Products Company, et al.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Oscar M. Gwin, Trading as O. M. Gwin Construction Company, Petitioner, vs. Peter Jung, Sr., et al.

904 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Harry L. Martin.

905 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Texas Steel Company, Petitioner, vs. Railroad Commission of Texas, et al.

906 — On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Civil Appeals, 3rd Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Civil Appeals, 3rd Supreme Judicial District, State of Texas, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Angelus Building & Investment Company, Petitioner, vs. Commissioner of Internal Revenue. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

909

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The City of South Norfolk, Richmond Sand & Gravel Corporation, et al., Petitioners, vs. Maryland Casualty Company. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

910

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arthur J. Stevens, as Sole Receiver of Island Oil & Transport Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Compania Petrolera Capuchinas, S. A. Compania Metropolitana De Oleoductos, et al. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

914

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary M. Lee, Executrix of the
Estate of Robert E. Lee,
Petitioner,
915 vs.
David Burnet, Commissioner of
Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Illinois Terminal Company,
Petitioner,
917 vs.
The United States.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Florence S. Schuette,
Petitioner,
918 vs.
Charles W. Anderson, Collector of
Internal Revenue for the Third
District of New York.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, Petitioner, vs. Charlie Thomas. 919

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The United States, Petitioner, vs. Flensburger Dampfercompagnie. 925

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Claims and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Erlanger Tremont Theatre Corporation, Petitioner, vs. Evelyn Ellsmore. 927

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

J. B. Davis, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America.

931

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

W. W. Easterday, Charles H. Greenhaus and Harry Greenhous, Petitioners, vs. The United States of America.

933

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Frank C. Ferguson, Collector of Internal Revenue, Petitioner, vs. Harry R. Nelson.

942

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Elmer Lawrence,
Petitioner,
943 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

The Greater City Surety and Indemnity Corporation and John Kelleher,
Petitioners,
944 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Arthur J. Fournier,
Petitioner,
951 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Erie Railroad Company,
Petitioner,
958 vs.
Zallie N. Booth.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Sam Comeriato, Tony Comeriato and William E. Roy,
Petitioners,
961 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

George Biemer,
Petitioner,
968 vs.
The United States of America.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Standard Accident Insurance Company of Detroit, Michigan, Inc., Petitioner, vs. Lillian M. Messervey. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

969

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Rosario Pellegrino, Petitioner, vs. A. C. Aderhold, Warden, United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Georgia. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

970

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Morris Heller, Petitioner, vs. The United States of America. — On petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

974

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had, it is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Mary Roxburghe,

Petitioner,

975 vs.

David Burnet, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

On petition for writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

On consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari herein to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and of the argument of counsel thereupon had,

It is now here ordered by this Court that the said petition be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Beckley Water Company,

Appellant,

857 vs.

Public Service Commission of West Virginia, The City of Beckley and the Town of Mabscott.

Appeal from the Supreme Court of Appeals of the State of West Virginia.

It appearing to the Court that counsel for the appellant has failed to file the statement as to jurisdiction as required by the Rules of this Court;

Therefore, in pursuance of the Twelfth Rule of this Court, it is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that this appeal be, and the same is hereby, dismissed with costs.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

O R D E R.

All cases submitted and all business before the Court at this term having been disposed of,

It is ordered by this Court that all cases on the docket be, and they are hereby, continued to the next term.

Per Mr. Chief Justice Hughes.

Proclamation being made the Court is adjourned to the time and place appointed by law.